

Respondent ID	Agent ID	Document Part Name	Comment (plain text)	TMBC response
38377665	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	59810 MES 9QJ. Something wrong here. The pdf shows a plot running across a roundabout which would be an insane place to build anything, although the postcode is in the middle of the housing on the top of Bluebell Hill	Noted, this will be checked.
42442561	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	As public consultation why is the community blind to the proposing call for site parties?	Comment noted. Respondent details are kept anonymous in accordance with the provisions of the General Data Protection Regulations.
42607681	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	<p>With regards to Aylesford North and Walderslade the list of sites are the same we've seen batted around for 3 years.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protected bats and newts live in the Quarry area near Aylesford village and the space near the Friars. The loss of such a wonderful habitat would be shameful. It's almost as if our local government couldn't care for the natural world at all. 2. Any site near Bull Lane and Bushey Wood will need to be prepared for the smell of sewage which surely would make building houses there a stupid idea. 3. Traffic through Aylesford village and Eccles is already a huge problem and adding almost 500+ houses will make things a whole lot worse. 4. The area near Bull Lane and Pilgrims way is currently a paddock for horses. Which is how it should remain. Once again an influx of traffic due to more houses will have a detrimental effect on both nature and the current traffic problems we face. 5. We have no local buses or a close enough train to avoid the possible gridlock all these new business and housing estates will produce for local residents. <p>I take it very few Councillors live out this way so have no idea what residents put up with on a daily basis.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42642785	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	I would suggest that any of these sites that are already development/previously developed land is a good place to start. Pilgrims way is a busy road used as a cut through to Peters village, Snodland, Maidstone etc and so development on this road would seem a good idea however given the already increasing risk of development around Eccles and Burham, a non-existing bus service (apart from twice a day and an additional one on Tuesday & Thursday), no local train service, overstretched doctors surgery coping with Peters village, Burham, Eccles, Wouldham and some of Bluebell Hill, this isn't a good location for further development.	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance, which includes the use of previously developed land and sustainable development. The infrastructure matters raised will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42642785	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	It's interesting to see sights in Eccles highlighted as potential development sites given that they are already earmarked by Trenport for their current plans for the village. This is somewhat confusing given they have submitted their plans already. If that development goes ahead, more than doubling the size of Eccles already, and then adding additional sites for development, Eccles will vanish and become an urban area with no public transport links, a school not big enough (even with a proposed new school by Trenport - not yet agreed), no doctors in the village (that is due to move to Peters village) and poor road networks (Aylesford village will become more gridlocked than it already as most people will cut through that way to get to Maidstone/Ditton etc).	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42420001	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	assessment out of date for Eccles and other nearby villages. there is no regular bus service	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42420001	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	assessment out of date. No longer has Eccles a regular bus service or a doctor attending surgery.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
38435937	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	<p>Sites 59766, 59851, 59674, 59670, 59678, 59847 are not within a short distance of a Railway Station unless a bridge is built over the River Medway.</p> <p>Site 59828 is north of Prating Street, Aylesford. At present Prating Street is the northern limit of commercial development and this should be retained to limit sprawl. The land of this site is good agricultural land (previously cereal and orchard).</p> <p>Development in the north of the Borough to the east side of the River Medway would have a negative impact on listed buildings and the setting of the North Downs AONB.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42814145	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	None	Comment noted.

44422593	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	<p>At this stage of the Local Plan process, the County Council has not provided commentary on all of the individual sites listed within this Appendix. The County Council would strongly encourage the Borough Council to engage with the County Council regard the assessment of the proposed development sites and growth strategy to better understand the infrastructure mitigation measures which may be required to support growth in the Borough.</p> <p>PRoW</p> <p>The County Council requests that as part of the site assessments and the preparation of the Draft Local Plan, the Borough Council has consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhancements to and positive incorporation of the existing PRoW network must be considered for each site, in preparation for the expected increase in use of the existing paths as a result of the proposed developments. - Local Plan policy should aim to protect and enhance the quality of PRoW contained within (or linking to) development sites. The inclusion of a PRoW reference will help support other policies within this document and send a clear message to developers that PRoW are a material consideration at the start of the planning process. - That the PRoW network is considered at an early stage of the design process and successfully incorporated into future developments. - The current ROWIP should be referenced as it is a statutory policy document for PRoW. It is crucial that this is referred to, as it is a strategic and statutory policy document for the protection and enhancement of PRoW. - The emerging Kent Design Guide - Financial contribution - new development provides opportunities to secure investment in the PRoW network, which could enhance opportunities for active travel and outdoor recreation across the Borough. Developer contributions are used to upgrade existing routes or create new path links that address existing network fragmentation and issues highlighted by the public. Inclusion should therefore be given to the investment of planning obligation contributions and s106 funding into the PRoW network. - Rail crossings – where PRoW from a new development into central amenities cross a rail line, due consideration has to be given to increase of use and the impact on crossing safety. Many PRoW currently cross “at grade” crossings, which are not deemed appropriate for higher level of use. - Enhanced connectivity for walking, cycling and equestrian activity across the borough, with a range of sustainable transport options available for the public and opportunities to access high quality open space. While the existing PRoW resource provides extensive opportunities for active travel and outdoor recreation, there are gaps in the network and accessibility issues that need to be addressed. Future growth and development should help to address these issues and enhance the PRoW network, so that the benefits of this access resource can be maximised by residents and visitors. - There should be a requirement for applicants to record the route of any PRoW affected by development, clarifying intentions for accommodating, diverting or enhancing paths. Any policy should clearly state that planning applications that would adversely affect the existing PRoW network will not be permitted. 	In drafting the Regulation 18b Local Plan as well as the publication draft of the borough LCWIP, the policy team will ensure that the PRoW network opportunities and ROWIP are appropriately considered.
45283457	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	<p>List of Local Plan Sites (Table 9)</p> <p>Table 9 of the Regulation 18 Consultation Local Plan provides a list of sites either presented via call for sites, urbans capacity study or withdrawn allocations, with over 300 sites presented. We have examined the larger sites (>500 units potential yield) as these will require particularly careful consideration and assessment of impacts. The distance from the nearest SRN is provided in the summary bullet points below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site ID 59861, Aylesford South and Ditton, ME20 6FH, potential yield 1,621 homes – the site is within 1.7km of the M20 J6. • Site ID 59818, Aylesford North and North Downs, ME1 3RR, potential yield 739 homes – the site is within 4km of the M20 J4. • Site ID 59749, East and West Peckham, Mereworth and Wateringbury, ME18 5JE, potential yield 828 homes – the site is within 6km of the M26 J2a. • Site ID 59752, East and West Peckham, Mereworth and Wateringbury, ME18 5LR, potential yield 1,390 homes – the site is within 6km of the M26 J2a. • Site ID 59806, East and West Peckham, Mereworth and Wateringbury, TN11 0JL, potential yield 3,289 homes – the site is within 7km of the M26 J2a. • Site ID 59811, Bourne, TN11 9SS, potential yield 2,362 homes – the site is within 7.5km of the M26 J2a. • Site ID 59797, East Malling, West Malling and Offham, ME18 5LW, potential yield 1,228 homes – the site is within 7km of the M20 J4. • Site ID 59802, East and West Peckham, Mereworth and Wateringbury, ME19 4PB, potential yield 644 homes – the site is within 8km of the M20 J4. • Site ID 59802, East and West Peckham, Mereworth and Wateringbury Bourne, TN11 9SS, potential yield 2,362 homes – the site is within 7.5km of the M26 J2a. <p>We will need to be satisfied that the cumulative impact of Local Plan traffic can be adequately mitigated. Any proposals of a significant scale (as identified above), sites which propose alterations to the SRN such as through new junction arrangements and any developments in proximity the SRN junction will require a particularly thorough and robust Transport Assessment to demonstrate that impacts on the SRN are mitigated and this will need to be developed in consultation with us. The Local Plan strategic modelling will need to demonstrate how the cumulative impact of development can be mitigated.</p> <p>The Lower Thames Crossing scenario must be considered in the future year assessment to determine potential impacts.</p>	Comments noted. Highways capacity and mitigation will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. TMBC and KCC are working closely with National Highways as we prepare our transport modelling evidence with consultants Jacobs, this will include growth scenarios and LTC sensitivity tests. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure requirements will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
46162977	0	Table 9 - List of Sites Aylesford North & Walderslade	<p>Local Plan Call for Sites. The Council intends to develop a strategic Local Plan to stop the apparent random growth of towns and villages, often without due consideration to the existing infrastructure. However, the sites identified in the Consultation Document give no confidence that the Council intends to honour the applaudable objectives set out in the Consultation Document.</p> <p>Acquaintances of ours recently moved from East Peckham into one of the 25 dwellings in the new development off Carpenters Lane, Hadlow (ref TM/20/00597/FL). Medical Centres in Hadlow and Tonbridge are unable to accommodate them. They have been advised that their previous GP/Medical Centre must keep them as patients until they are able to be taken on by a local GP. That may appear not to be a problem because East Peckham is not very far from Hadlow, but it would be a significant problem if they had moved to Hadlow from a different part of the country. We are aware of similar stories of the lack of availability regarding schooling.</p> <p>Site 59635 (also planning application TM/22/01474/FL awaiting decision) is for 57 residential dwellings on 'Land Formerly West Part Of Court Lane Nurseries Court Lane Hadlow Tonbridge Kent'. I do not understand how this potential development can be justified when residents of the newly completed, and smaller, Carpenters Lane development cannot even be accommodated within the current local infrastructure.</p> <p>All sites listed in the Local Plan for Bourne show SA Objective 1: (To improve human health and well-being) as a significant positive (++). 'This site is within 800m of an existing healthcare facility' is stated as qualifying criteria. The distance may be correct but that is entirely irrelevant if there is no availability. Proximity to unreliable bus services is similarly misleading. Bourne sites should all be rejected and the sustainability criteria re-evaluated realistically for every site listed in the Local Plan.</p>	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure requirements will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.