

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42213665	Non-technical summary	Well structured and reasonable in ambition.	Support noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Well structured and reasonable in expectation.	Support noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	All issues identified are relevant and very important. Consideration of each issue must be ongoing to ensure the Plan can keep up with prevailing pressures (for example climate change and water supplies).	Comment noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Comprehensive methodology.	Support noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Comprehensive and relevant.	Support noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Option 1- Minimises overall impact in my opinion.	Comment noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Option 1 will lessen the overall negative effects of development for the duration of the Plan in my opinion.	Comment noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Option 3 will reduce the overall negative impact of the Plan for its duration in my opinion.	Comment noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Option 1 would reduce the overall negative impact of development across the area. However, a suitable sustainable public transport system with improved links to London and surrounding towns must be provided.	Comment noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	The prevention of urban sprawl is vital in protecting the individual characters of the various locales in this area. Subject to an effectively enforced strategic gap policy, Option 2 will be the most pragmatic solution. Otherwise, Option 1 would be my choice.	Comment noted.
42810689	Non-technical summary	Having lived in Hadlow village for 62 years I have witnessed several flood events. The environmental flood information is limited. Surface water flooding has been severe flooding and closing the village in the past and in 2012 the fire service was required to assist with preventing flooding of the A26. The increased building already of housing eg. Carpenters lane, Spa Court, etc. and proposal on Court Lane with no upgrading of flood prevention or other infrastructure is already leading to stress and reduced wellbeing in the population. Several applications for housing have been refused in the past due to flood risk and these plots of land now appear on this new proposal eg. Land off court lane, Land adjacent to the river Bourne, Land at end of Carpenters Lane, land past Hadlow Park all of which have been refused by Tonbridge and Malling or its predecessor in the past due, in part, to flood risk.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding are considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and taken into account when applying the sequential and exceptions test in accordance with the NPPF.
42832705	Non-technical summary	For any development to meet its sustainability objectives it needs to recognise the environment in which it is being proposed: It needs to be recognised that any development between East Malling into West Malling from Mill Street along Claire Lane would require new pavements and lighting so that any new housing would have access to existing community facilities without encouraging additional motor vehicle use; additional pavements and lighting along Claire Lane would cause damage to a distinct countryside environment impacting wildlife habitat through interruption of "darkskies" environments. Incomplete ecology impact and air quality surveys need to be completed and associated issues addressed in line with the overall, cumulative impact of changes resulting from proposed development (not on a case-by-case basis) need to be addressed against very localised claims (e.g biodiversity increases in localised developments e.g unqualified/ unquantified 30% increases in biodiversity)	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes and these matters will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The Green Infrastructure Strategy and Air Quality Assessment evidence are currently being carried out.
42832705	Non-technical summary	For any development to meet its sustainability objectives it needs to recognise the environment in which it is being proposed: It needs to be recognised that any development between East Malling into West Malling from Mill Street along Claire Lane would require new pavements and lighting so that any new housing would have access to existing community facilities without encouraging additional motor vehicle use; additional pavements and lighting along Claire Lane would cause damage to a distinct countryside environment impacting wildlife habitat through interruption of "darkskies" environments. Incomplete ecology impact and air quality surveys need to be completed and associated issues addressed in line with the overall, cumulative impact of changes resulting from proposed development (not on a case-by-case basis) need to be addressed against very localised claims (e.g biodiversity increases in localised developments e.g unqualified/ unquantified 30% increases in biodiversity)	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes and these matters will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The Green Infrastructure Strategy and Air Quality Assessment evidence are currently being carried out.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42832705	Non-technical summary	For any development to meet its sustainability objectives it needs to recognise the environment in which it is being proposed: It needs to be recognised that any development between East Malling into West Malling from Mill Street along Claire Lane would require new pavements and lighting so that any new housing would have access to existing community facilities without encouraging additional motor vehicle use; additional pavements and lighting along Claire Lane would cause damage to a distinct countryside environment impacting wildlife habitat through interruption of "darkskies" environments. Incomplete ecology impact and air quality surveys need to be completed and associated issues addressed in line with the overall, cumulative impact of changes resulting from proposed development (not on a case-by-case basis) need to be addressed against very localised claims (e.g biodiversity increases in localised developments e.g unqualified/ unquantified 30% increases in biodiversity)	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes and these matters will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The Green Infrastructure Strategy and Air Quality Assessment evidence are currently being carried out.
42832705	Non-technical summary	Greater emphasis needs to be given to Option 1	Comment noted.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Generally, I think the Interim Sustainability Appraisal has sound methodology and addresses all key issues. I hope that it proves successful in ensuring that there is correct and consistent consideration of all issues across every site identified for potential development and that standards are not watered down over time because of political or economic pressures.	Support noted.
42404257	Non-technical summary	Do please check existing levels of infrastructure, for example in the case of Watlingbury the roads are already challenged, the school is a one class intake and the doctor's surgery is not taking any more onto its roll....	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42437217	Non-technical summary	<p>The Grange farmlands fields back on to my house in (redacted). The fields are very susceptible to flooding during prolonged rain! There is also the issue of the CLH OIL PIPELINE which runs through/ across these fields!!!! Has anybody thought of this obstacle??</p> <p>I have lived at my present house for over 40 years and every year there has been various alternating crops grown in these fields and very recently there have been Red kites and different species of bats returning to these fields. The fact that this is green belt area seems to be deemed acceptable in this day and age. I can irrevocably condemn any housing development of any sort on the aforementioned lands.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42487649	Non-technical summary	This appraisal must consider the impact on the area involved - the natural environment area as well as the built environment.	Comments noted.
42519041	Non-technical summary	Existing infrastructure is barely able to cope with existing homes/businesses. It is unviable to propose the extensive building. The heavy traffic that uses the crossroads at Watlingbury has resulted in this being 24% over capacity; increased also by recent developments in Maidstone and Paddock Wood areas. These same crossroads are the most polluted in Kent. Wildlife, hedges and open space will be lost. The surrounding narrow, single track, unlit lanes will become gridlocked. How are our GP, school and transport facilities expected to cope with any increased population? We are currently subject to a hosepipe ban, where would the water come from to service new homes/businesses?	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42792257	Non-technical summary	Measuring sustainability against social, economic and environmental issues is overly simplistic. Sustainability is an ambiguous word that has never been clearly defined. It is however clear that social, economic and environmental demands will always be in conflict and history tells us that the environment will always be the loser when money and human requirements are at stake. I see nothing in your vision, policy or monitoring proposals that alter this basic dynamic.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Well structured and reasonable in ambition.	Support noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42487649	Non-technical summary	At each stage of this process I believe for true transparency the local community are kept fully informed on progress. It should be recognised that there are various means of keeping local people informed and not to rely on I.T.	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.
42591937	Non-technical summary	at a meeting held in Ightham Village Hall recently, we were told this form would be easy to navigate, I have yet met anyone who has tried to comment on the Local Plan who feels it is easy. I fact a few have commented that it's as though we are being discourage from giving our views.	Comment noted.
42588673	Non-technical summary	This consultation process has been set in motion very late, and with insufficient notice to those whose opinions are being sought.	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Well structured and reasonable in expectation.	Comment noted.
25315361	Non-technical summary	<p>“Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development, including qualitative aspects such as design of places, landscapes, and development.”</p> <p>If, as seems likely, development is to be concentrated in particular regions of the Borough, then that disadvantage for those areas should be recognised by a compensating rebalancing within those regions of the weighting given to residents’ views versus those of developers.</p> <p>For example, in the area of ecology it should be recognised that areas outside the Green Belt by receiving disproportionate development are already making a major a major contribution to biodiversity within the Green Belt. They should not therefore be obliged to accept oppressive development proposals in order to achieve further relatively trivial gains in biodiversity. Recent planning submissions have proposed building on prime agricultural land rather than designated scrubland using biodiversity as a justification. Non-Green Belt residents are already at a disadvantage to Green Belt residents when it comes to development proposals. If wildlife were to be given undue priority outside the Green Belt then then there is a risk that residents in those areas would effectively be treated as the lowest form of life in the Borough.</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42078593	Non-technical summary	The inclusion of affordable housing should be a significant feature of the Plan if we are to ensure key workers are able to live locally and families on low incomes can afford to live in the borough.	Comment noted.
42591937	Non-technical summary	<p>Re Proposed site 59770- Public Transport through Ightham is appalling with scheduled buses, running less than 1 an hour and often not turning up at all. Most resident and business traffic would have to pull out onto the A 25 opposite the Recreation ground where there are already serious concerns about the road safety, especially at the nearby junction of Sevenoaks Road, Old Bury Lane (ghtham Primary School) and the A 25. Traffic would be increased in Rectory Lane towards the A 227 which is very narrow being only wide enough for one car. It would cause chaos. Our front wall has been struck by vehicles 3 times in the last 3 months.</p> <p>The proposed development and subsequent effects of an increase in population would be detrimental to the AONB and Green Belt and also the nearby SSSI (Oldbury Woods) land in which this site sits.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42588673	Non-technical summary	We are asked to comment on proposals for development submitted by local landowners and developers, which seem to have little regard to the community infrastructure or facilities.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Comprehensive methodology.	Support noted.
42588673	Non-technical summary	The use of this is not understood	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Option 1- Minimises overall impact in my opinion.	Support for Option 1 noted.
38532513	Non-technical summary	In my opinion you should NOT go for 10% over. It will be a struggle to find enough land for even option 1	Comment noted.
42487649	Non-technical summary	Any proposed housing development does not take into account the number of cars per household and base their calculations on outdated government guidelines. Additionally, any apartments that are built have Service Charges that if not managed properly are unaffordable. There are models where owners/residents have an elected board to monitor value for money.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Option 1 will lessen the overall negative effects of development for the duration of the Plan in my opinion.	Support for Option 1 noted
42213665	Non-technical summary	Option 3 will reduce the overall negative impact of the Plan for its duration in my opinion.	Support for Option 3 noted.
42441313	Non-technical summary	Building thousands of new homes will destroy our environment. Building hundreds of homes around villages, where resources are already thin, will ruin the area. Development of existing urban areas (Snodland, Paddock Wood, Borough Green) would lessen the impact.	Comment noted. These matters will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
38532513	Non-technical summary	I tend to agree that options 4 and 5 would be the worst because with development spread out there would be more need for people to travel longer distances, and most would be driving from rural areas thereby increasing road congestion and air pollution.	Comment noted. These matters will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42171937	Non-technical summary	There is no option here which absolutely guarantees the non-use of Green Belt land. This should have been included.	All reasonable alternative development site options have been appraised consistently, in accordance with the site assessment criteria contained within Appendix D of the Interim SA Report.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Option 1 would reduce the overall negative impact of development across the area. However, a suitable sustainable public transport system with improved links to London and surrounding towns must be provided.	Comment noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
38532513	Non-technical summary	I agree that option 1 is better for minimising land take, cutting down travel and therefore reducing the impact on traffic congestion and on air quality and climate emissions; but I am worried about the impact on water and on available green space for residents within the town. I feel it very important to ensure that children have access to close play spaces, and also that any mature trees should be left. It seems crazy to be cutting down any trees at the same time as urging people to plant more (thinking of the site on Bishops Oak Ride). I am worried about the impact on water and flooding because almost all of Tonbridge is a high flood risk area.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42213665	Non-technical summary	The prevention of urban sprawl is vital in protecting the individual characters of the various locales in this area. Subject to an effectively enforced strategic gap policy, Option 2 will be the most pragmatic solution. Otherwise, Option 1 would be my choice.	Comments noted.
38532513	Non-technical summary	It is very difficult to quantify the affects of the different 3 options for preventing the merging of settlements in the NE of the borough in isolation from the rest of the borough. I say this because if little development is allowed around eg West Malling station, more development will be needed elsewhere in the borough in order to fulfill the housing needs. This is an area that has far less risk of flooding than Tonbridge or Snodland, and so although 6 is improved for that area of the borough by taking options 1 or 2, 8 and 11 will be very much worsened if other parts of the borough with high flood risk take more development. 4, 11 and 12 would be improved if development took place close to West Malling station because this would minimise traffic congestion.	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.
42832705	Non-technical summary	Greater emphasis needs to be given to Option 1	Comment noted.
42441313	Non-technical summary	Building many new homes in rural villages with single track roads can only be disastrous, both during and after any build. There are insufficient services (doctors, schools, hospitals, water) as it is.	Comment noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42487649	Non-technical summary	<p>Site 59703/59617 residential are listed twice but are the same. I am note sure why?</p> <p>This site (both 59703/59617) on Potash Lane is located in an area of difficult access. Currently the single lanes are used by local people who often walk for exercise and use their cars when needed. On street parking is extremely limited and access via all routes is not easy. A part of Comp Lane is a non HGV route. The turn at the junction of Long Mill lane into Potash Lane is extremely acute for a vehicle/car turning.</p> <p>The site specified is open land and is situated within 250m of a heritage asset as well as being within 250m of one or more internationally/nationally designated biodiversity/geodiversity sites. This area is green open space that would be lost as a result of a new development and negatively affect the street scene of the existing settlement of houses some of which are listed.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42487649	Non-technical summary	<p>Site: 59830. I strongly oppose this proposal for a housing development - also know as a Garden City.</p> <p>My concerns are as follows:</p> <p>The negative impact on public services that are over stretched that this proposal to build on Metropolitan Green Belt adjoining an Area of Natural Outstanding Beauty</p> <p>The negative impact of building a large estate that is proposed to be adjacent to the rural villages of Borough Green and Ightham.</p> <p>The increase of traffic generated by 3000 houses as well as the pressure placed upon the already busy A25 and A227 roads.</p> <p>The pollution levels in Borough Green are extremely high and this development will add to this bringing level dangerously high.</p> <p>The public transport services in the area are currently under threat as well as already being cut significantly putting more pressure to use cars on the roads.</p> <p>The consequences of changing the quality of the lives of these small communities into an urban sprawl.</p>	<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.</p>
42213665	Non-technical summary	All issues identified are relevant and very important. Consideration of each issue must be ongoing to ensure the Plan can keep up with prevailing pressures (for example climate change and water supplies).	Comments noted.
42404257	Non-technical summary	On a local (to me) level Watlingbury is a historic environment the last thing we need is a brand new estate of houses - totally out of keeping, the infrastructure just will not cope. The more you put Kent under concrete the more the risk of flooding. Plus the added traffic this would generate will only add to the poor air quality in the village (the black spot is the crossroads).	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
25315361	Non-technical summary	<p>“Projected population growth has the potential to increase greenhouse gas emissions from a variety of lifestyle choices such as private vehicle use. Actions and objectives to reduce the borough’s carbon emissions will need to take this into account. New development could reduce associated emissions relative to existing developments through appropriate selection of sustainable building design and materials.”</p> <p>These statements are misguided. The use of sustainable building materials gives a one-off climate advantage, the use of private vehicles gives an ongoing, continuing and unbounded climate disadvantage. The reduction of private vehicle use is primary, the other considerations are secondary. The reduction of private vehicle use can be best tackled by the judicious spatial distribution of development sites, in terms of minimising car journeys and by creating sustainable configurations for economically viable public transport.</p> <p>In any case, the selection of development sites on the basis of minimising of private vehicle use does not preclude good building practice and sustainable development. Any reduction of private vehicle use is an additional saving over and any savings from other initiatives.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42487649	Non-technical summary	<p>With large developments that are proposed for example - Borough Green Garden City Site 59830; the impact on the Area of Natural Outstanding Beauty, pressure on existing services and the environment would be catastrophic. The whole site is one of Metropolitan Green Belt needing exceptional circumstances to allow development.</p> <p>The areas detailed above also impact on the environment an services and applies to other large/smaller proposed areas for development within the Borough.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42078593	Non-technical summary	<p>Any developments should seek to enhance biodiversity via the inclusion of Swift/House Sparrow/Bat boxes on new builds and on the renovation of suitable existing buildings. The KCC Biodiversity Strategy already includes a target to ensure that every new house in Kent contains one such brick.</p> <p>In terms of existing buildings, ecological surveys undertaken before May or after August each year do not identify where Swifts are already nesting as they have already migrated. Therefore important nests can be lost when buildings are "improved".</p> <p>The British Standards Institute has recently established a standard (BS42021, Integral Nestboxes) for the installation of Swift nest boxes.</p> <p>Within the Kent Biodiversity Strategy both Turtle Doves and Nightingales are listed as priority species (both are "Red Listed"), both species have small breeding but significant populations along the Medway River east of the town.</p>	Comments noted. These will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42587297	Non-technical summary	para 34-36 place climate change as something which happen in the future - whereas there is good evidence that this is now taking place and is already impacting on weather extremes (including heat), flood risk and biodiversity loss and species change in TMBC If we are to adapt and deliver on the scale of the emergency, we need to bring the community along with nature of these changes. Indicating that these changes are happening, now, and that we need to adapt, is part of that community awareness.	Comments noted. These will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42499105	Non-technical summary	The explosion of population in and around Kings Hill will result in unsustainable demand on the capacity of the GP surgery that is already struggling. Previous developer promises to provide capacity have not been fulfilled. We cannot believe them without contractual and financial commitments.	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42723809	Non-technical summary	I live in Watlingbury and the air quality is really under pressure because of the high volume of traffic that uses the A26 and surrounding roads. Any further residential development in this area would not be sustainable and would degrade even further the air quality and consequently local people's quality of life and health.	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42591937	Non-technical summary	I agree that population increase in the area will increase pressure for the borough to comply with KCC goals. Our recycling facilities are poor and we have to go to Sevenoaks to use their dump. Waste collection services are struggling to cope with the existing demand, adding more houses to a collection round will mean more pressure.	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42771489	Non-technical summary	Find it difficult to understand how a satisfactory balance can be achieved between increased provision of open space and access to countryside when the countryside and good agricultural land is being identified and earmarked for development which in turn will surely destroy these areas. Provision of open leisure space should not include golf clubs. Whilst they may preserve the visual impact of an area, there are already plenty of these in the borough and generally only benefit a small group of the populace.	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.
42588673	Non-technical summary	With regard to the proposals concerning the Mereworth locality, the principal highways through the area are overstretched and frequently jammed because of incidents on the single carriageway roads. these incidents are on many occasions caused by weather-related issues, such as flooding. The volume of traffic on most of the roads is such that there is little capacity for additional users.	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42810689	Non-technical summary	Having lived in Hadlow village for 62 years I have witnessed several flood events. The environmental flood information is limited. Surface water flooding has been severe flooding and closing the village in the past and in 2012 the fire service was required to assist with preventing flooding of the A26. The increased building already of housing eg. Carpenters lane, Spa Court, etc. and proposal on Court Lane with no upgrading of flood prevention or other infrastructure is already leading to stress and reduced wellbeing in the population. Several applications for housing have been refused in the past due to flood risk and these plots of land now appear on this new proposal eg. Land off court lane, Land adjacent to the river Bourne, Land at end of Carpenters Lane, land past Hadlow Park all of which have been refused by Tonbridge and Malling or its predecessor in the past due, in part, to flood risk.	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will also be preparing a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42832705	Non-technical summary	For any development to meet its sustainability objectives it needs to recognise the environment in which it is being proposed: It needs to be recognised that any development between East Malling into West Malling from Mill Street along Claire Lane would require new pavements and lighting so that any new housing would have access to existing community facilities without encouraging additional motor vehicle use; additional pavements and lighting along Claire Lane would cause damage to a distinct countryside environment impacting wildlife habitat through interruption of "darksies" environments. Incomplete ecology impact and air quality surveys need to be completed and associated issues addressed in line with the overall, cumulative impact of changes resulting from proposed development (not on a case-by-case basis) need to be addressed against very localised claims (e.g biodiversity increases in localised developments e.g unqualified/ unquantified 30% increases in biodiversity)	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.
42213665	Non-technical summary	Comprehensive and relevant.	Support noted.
42441313	Non-technical summary	The addition of thousands of new homes in the borough can only be detrimental to the area, resources and residents.	Comment relating to housing noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
38532513	Non-technical summary	So far I have not commented because I agreed with the aims. But here I must comment that although I agree that we need a mix of tenure, if you leave private developers to lead according to 'market forces' you will not get a good mix of accommodation. Rather you need to involve the council to ensure that there is affordable accommodation to rent. Renting from private landlords is problematic because there is no security and it forces families to move frequently which disrupts the childrens education. We need something like the old council houses. There is a shortage of key workers in the area because it is just too expensive for young keyworkers to buy or rent.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25315361	Non-technical summary	<p>No one can disagree with the objective to reduce crime and antisocial behaviour, but there is a danger that this is addressed by solutions that are too simplistic. One only has to look at mistakes made by planners of the past.</p> <p>Recent planning applications seem to favour wide open spaces lacking in privacy and the removal of back alleys and cut throughs. (Although, interestingly, some of the older neighbourhoods of Kings Hill are attractive because they adopt the opposite approach.) The risk here is that attempts to reduce crime could lead to developments that feel sterile rather than organic so that people feel detached from their environment and no longer identify with their neighbourhood. This lack of identification can itself lead to vandalism.</p> <p>In summary, people who commit crime or display antisocial behaviour are often detached from the community. This can be best addressed by attractive developments with a genuine neighbourhood feel.</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42723809	Non-technical summary	Regarding the local housing need. I have not understood the evidence of who actually needs the houses and what type of accommodation is actually needed. I am very concerned that developers as they have done previously in this borough, cram loads of houses and flats into the local area with no thought for providing homes that are pleasant to live in, homes that benefit from local infrastructure such as doctor's surgeries, schools etc and homes that are eco-friendly and blend in with the environment. Instead developers are just concerned with profit. And as such ruin the local area to the detriment of us, the people who live here.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42591937	Non-technical summary	Whenever housing proposals are put forward the plans always include the required low cost housing that is needed to get past the planning stage. However, when the developments are completed, often the number of affordable homes built are significantly below what was originally agreed and there would appear to be no comeback on the house builders.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42588673	Non-technical summary	It is not clear how any of these objectives can be fulfilled without greater and urgent attention to the provision of increased capacity on the highways; better control over traffic speeds; improved community facilities (medical, educational, public transport, water supply etc).	Comment noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
25315361	Non-technical summary	<p>'Within 400m of an existing bus stop' is too crude to be an Indicator. Eccles, Burham and Aylesford were promised a bus service of up to 2 buses per hour as part of the Peters village proposal. The bus service has recently been reduced to 2 buses per week. Some sites are within 400m of a bus stop which has 2 buses per week, some sites are within 400m of a bus stop which has a bus every 15 minutes. There is a clear distinction between such cases, they should not be lumped together.</p> <p>'No major development within AONBs', in the case of the North Downs this target is too restrictive. The views from and of the North Downs are also a consideration. If development is allowed right up to the boundary of the ANOB, then the North Downs could become little more than a backdrop to a clutter of development. Some of the most uplifting views within the Borough are those of the North Downs escarpment viewed across and from the distinctive rural setting below.</p>	As explained in the full Interim SA Report (paras 2.38 and D.2), the site assessment criteria include a number of distance-based criteria used to estimate the likely effects of site options. A number of the appraisal assumptions refer to accessibility from site options to services, facilities, employment, etc. There are a number of pieces of research that give a variety of recommended guidance distances for walking. For example, the Institute of Highways and Transportation found that the average length of a walk journey is one kilometre. Further to this, it categorises distances depending upon the location and purpose of the trip, as 'desirable', 'acceptable' or 'preferred maximum'. Given the wide range of services and facilities normally considered in SAs, LUC has developed some guideline distances that it uses in its SA work, and which are therefore reflected in the site assessment criteria

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441313	Non-technical summary	As before, hugely increasing development in rural areas will ruin the environment for nature and for people. To double the number of homes in villages such as Watlington, West Malling and Mereworth would be shockingly detrimental to those who already live there. We chose to live in a rural environment and are angry that the very nature of our homes is threatened. Some of the sites, especially in my home village of Mereworth, show no consideration of the existing lack of amenities in the village (no restaurant, pub, leisure facilities or DECENT ROADS)	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.
25315361	Non-technical summary	<p>“Minimise the loss of Grade 1, 2 and Grade 3a ALC land”</p> <p>“Avoid development of ‘best and most versatile’ soil.”</p> <p>With the increase of viticulture within the Borough, this approach is too restrictive. Soil doesn’t have to be ‘versatile’ in order to grow specific specialist crops such as grapes for viniculture.</p> <p>Some of the best wine in the world is produced from some of the poorest quality soil.</p> <p>https://www.vivino.com/wine-news/why-does-poor-quality-soil-make-such-great-wine#:~:text=So%20why%20does%20poor%20soil,goes%20straight%20into%20the%20grapes.</p> <p>In terms of revenue per acre, the economic value of land that is capable of producing good wine is typically far greater than the economic value of Grade 1 land and such land should be regarded as a national asset that should be vigorously protected from development.</p> <p>Furthermore, the terroir for good grape production is a combination of microclimate, soil drainage, and elevation. Within the Borough, land with good characteristics for wine growing is far rarer than is Grade 1 agricultural land.</p> <p>When it comes to protection from development, land suitable for viticulture should be given greater priority than Grade 1 agricultural land.</p> <p>In the first instance, perhaps, there should be a requirement that any developer wishing to build within so many metres of an existing vineyard should have to commission a study on the wine production potential of the proposed development site.</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25315361	Non-technical summary	<p>* To encourage development of brownfield land where appropriate. * To reduce the amount of derelict, contaminated, and vacant land.</p> <p>The previous draft Regulation 18 document (for the previous draft plan) referred to any sites that had been previously developed (also known as 'brownfield' sites). It then decided to focus on the opportunities of responding to assessed needs on previously-developed land within the built-up confines of existing settlements.</p> <p>For some reason the decision was made to focus on a specific subset of brownfield sites rather than all brownfield sites. This policy should not be adopted again without a specific justification.</p> <p>Whilst it is a great idea to reduce the amount of derelict, contaminated, and vacant land, practical policies for achieving this have not been proposed here. The fundamental issue here is that it is cheaper for developers to build upon greenfield. They have found that it is in their interest to preferentially nurture wildlife on less attractive land so that they can build on agricultural land on the basis that it is ecologically less diverse. This latter reasoning if taken to its logical conclusion would see all useful land in the Borough allocated for development in order to protect all unwanted land as a habitat for nature.</p> <p>There needs to be a clear policy to ensure that brownfield and vacant sites are not protected on the basis of biodiversity except in the most exceptional cases. Such a policy might mandate that brownfield sites should normally achieve biodiversity by offsetting elsewhere.</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42487649	Non-technical summary	<p>The need for an efficient broad band provider is a must for the borough.</p> <p>The use of I.T has expanded since the Covid Pandemic and not all areas in Tonbridge & Malling have fibre, which is needed.</p>	Comments noted.
42387809	SA Report	Tonbridge needs mor people in the town centre to keep it alive, as offered in Option 1	Comment noted.
25315361	SA Report	A further limitation is that the existing Land Agricultural Classification System is not fit for purpose in regard to viticulture. At the time of the last Local Plan exercise there were few if any vineyards in the Borough. The acreage devoted to viticulture is currently growing exponentially. The potential revenue per acre and the scarcity of land suitable for viticulture greatly exceeds that for Grade 1 ALC land. The preservation of land for viticulture should have a greater priority than the preservation of grade 1 ALC land.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42052833	SA Report	<p>The Council was forced to withdraw the earlier Plan as the Inspector found that it had failed in its duty to co-operate with neighboring authorities as required by the NPPF and in particular the need to meet the shortfall in housing provision in Sevenoaks district. (xxx)</p> <p>The NPPF is clear that any housing need not being met by neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for. (xxx)</p> <p>This draft Plan is silent on what steps have been undertaken to co-operate with neighbouring authorities and how it is seeking to resolve the expected shortfall in housing provision at Sevenoaks. (xxx)</p> <p>In this context, the proposed provision of 839 dwellings per year must be regarded as a minimum until such time as it is apparent that Sevenoaks Council will be meeting its own housing needs in full. (xxx)</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The Council continues to carry out Duty to Cooperate meetings with Sevenoaks DC.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25315361	SA Report	<p>Under para 3.55, the issue of AONBs must be considered not just in terms of development on the ANOB but in terms of development up against the AONBs. The North Downs AONB is as much an asset when viewed from beyond the base as from the summit. Yet current planning assessments seem to prioritise views from the North Downs and not views of the AONB from within the near landscape below. A recent comment from the North Downs ANOB in response to the Bushey Wood proposal stated that “In order to help the development, recede as far as possible into the landscape when viewed from the AONB, we would request that it is specified that pale coloured facing materials are not used on elevations facing towards views from the AONB” The implication here being that is no problem with bright buildings detracting from the views of the Downs from below, even if those buildings are within 500 metres of the base of the ANOB area.</p> <p>Under para 3.74, flooding is considered only in terms of rainfall and storms. Below Allington lock the river Medway is tidal and the principal issue is (or should be) sea level. Unless the Local Plan recognises this distinction, there is risk that provisions for flooding could be too liberal or too conservative in areas affected by tidal water.</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The Council will also be preparing a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42052833	SA Report	<p>This assessment is in our view very crude. It does not take account of the pressures that previous development has had on parts of the District, the difficulties involved with delivering major urban expansions and new settlements and the benefits that new development can have for smaller settlements.</p> <p>The Council faces a challenge in meeting the objectively assessed needs for housing, which in the case of Tonbridge & Malling amounts to 839 dwellings per annum or 15,941 dwellings across the plan period to 2040. (xxx)</p> <p>It is vitally important that the Local Plan identifies a mixed portfolio of sites to provide opportunities for small and medium sized developers. The NPPF is clear that planning authorities should be providing a range of sites and that small and medium sized sites make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area. Sites should be identified adjacent to towns and villages across the settlement hierarchy. This would assist in supporting and enhancing local services and facilities. (xxx)</p> <p>In this context, we do not believe that it is correct to continue to concentrate development just on the settlements beyond the Green Belt at Snodland and The Medway Gap as illustrated in Option 1. These areas have taken a huge amount of recent development and although they probably could accommodate more it would be unreasonable to concentrate all of the new development here. (xxx)</p> <p>We do not believe that a new settlement as proposed by option 5 is viable. The lead in times for such projects are enormous and land assembly can be very complex. It is extremely doubtful that it could be achieved within the timeframe of the Local Plan (xxx)</p> <p>We consider that Option 4 of distributing development across the borough focusing on greenfield and previously developed land, rural service centres and other rural settlements presents the best overall strategy. (xxx)</p> <p>Such an approach would allow for a sensible review of the Green Belt boundary in these areas and allow a limited but controlled expansion of those settlements that could accommodate additional growth, both for housing and employment. (xxx)</p> <p>For instance, we believe that the built-up area of Addington should be extended to include the residential areas comprising The Links and Humphries Park Mitsubushi. It should also be extended southwards across the A20 down to the railway to include site 59604/59606. (xxx)</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. These matters will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722497	SA Report	<p>I would like to object to the proposed potential Residential Development of the site 59617 and 59703 in Potash Lane, Platt.</p> <p>This plot is in the Green Belt and is outside the village envelope. It is located in Potash Lane which effectively is a single track road which makes it extremely difficult for HGV vehicles to gain access. The roads are already congested for the existing homeowners to use and we already suffer from a lack of parking in Potash Lane.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is adjacent to an Area of Natural Beauty and a Conservation area and it would obscure the view from The Barn which is a Listed Building.</p> <p>I have spoken with several neighbours and they are all in agreement with my comments.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42438273	SA Report	<p>It would appear that Option 1 is the least detrimental of the 2 options.</p> <p>This is however on the assumption that wellbeing is improved by growth of population in more urban areas generating sufficient volume of people to make it viable to improve the infrastructure such as health provision to improve peoples experience. While this may occur - it is not a given and may well simply put further pressure on existing stretched infrastructure.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42436577	SA Report	<p>This section muddles cause and effect of the suggested actions - at 4.6 it is not necessary to have more houses to improve the health and wellbeing provision. All new development is likely to make existing shortfalls worse. The improvements to the infrastructure is needed now, not as part of further growth in the numbers of houses. At 4.8 the AQMA improvements should be delivered to benefit the existing local residents who are suffering - adding more houses can only make things worse - let's fix the problems now, not wait for further development. Car use is high because there are limited alternative means of transport - better still would be closer facilities as most people would prefer to be within walking or cycling distance of work, schools, shops and doctors.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42438273	SA Report	<p>Options 3, 4 and 5 appear to be particularly negative in their impact and I would not therefore support any of these.</p> <p>All options with the possible exception of Option 1 are likely to fundamentally change the nature of the area in a detrimental way.</p>	Comments noted.
42438273	SA Report	Option 1 would appear to be a little less negative than option 2.	Comments noted.
42438273	SA Report	<p>It is quite difficult for the lay person to understand what each of these options actually mean.</p> <p>Personally, I would not like to reduce the green belt and would not like to merge West Malling, Kings Hill and East Malling into one large dwelling area with no greenspace between it.</p>	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42716609	SA Report	The sites located in Leybourne are all small green spaces used for recreational purposes, exercise and dog walking. These are all vitally important to the community and if they were to be built on then the area would have very little appeal to residents. Leybourne is already very well developed and the green spaces proposed to be developed are widely used. Specifically sites 59456, 59432, 59441, and 59445 all are heavily depended upon green spaces for the residents and are part of what makes Leybourne a great village to live in. Residents of leybourne strongly object to any development within our village.	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.
42438273	SA Report	<p>59750, 59749, 59599, 59597, 59752, 59816, 59598, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59758, 59754, 59757, 59761 - all of these sites represent significant destruction of greenbelt, loss of rural classification and potential devastation of the character of the village of Mereworth. There is little infrastructure in the village already - these would put further pressure on traffic, environment, local services such as schools, health and public transport. While a small number of additional houses (in single figures) would not be an issue the scale of these proposals is devastating. Mereworth would be subsumed into a greater Kingshill.</p> <p>59884, 59634, 59603 - Represent excessive loss of green space in Kingshill which is increasingly densely populated and has relatively less and less green space.</p> <p>59797, 59866, 59811, 59830 are excessive in size, represent major loss of greenbelt/rural landscape, significant increase in traffic, loss of environmental quality and pressure on infrastructure.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42762433	SA Report	Where is the evidence that we need 16000 houses in a borough that is already overrun by housing with inadequate infrastructure. You cannot get an appointment with a GP for love nor money, there is not adequate water supply, power supply or sewage disposal as it is. There is no thought given when granting planning permission to improvement of surrounding roads etc. it is a disgrace.	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42798817	SA Report	NB. In the 1990's my role at the Home Office was to produce guidance for all of the 10 x EU 2004 Accession Countries on their environmental legislation. This is because the EU thought that if the UK was happy with the legislation, then this would be the acceptable minimum. EU Local Agenda 21 and the Environmental Acquis is based on UK Environmental legislation.	Comments noted.
42798817	SA Report	Each of these areas should include an incentivisation plan/penalty plan to encourage changes in community behaviour which prioritises environmental protection (e.g. better/more incentives and financial support to insulate homes/ install ground source heat pumps/purchase rainwater collection tools/purchase EV vehicles and chargers etc etc) and which will lead to more environmental protection activities, as well as safeguarding the individual characteristics of the settlements.	Comments noted.
42798817	SA Report	I understand the pressure to build houses, however, these cannot be built without the corresponding increased capacity in school/hospitals/doctors/dentists and other community resources.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42803809	SA Report	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I am here speaking on behalf of the volunteer pond wardens in Kent who are increasingly concerned about the quality of Kent's natural fresh waters, from both the public health and biodiversity points of view. We are concerned that inadequate provision has been made and continues to be made for waste water treatment in Local Planning, leading first to the discharge of untreated waste water into the natural environment and secondly, even if waste waters are adequately treated to convert the organic wastes to minerals, to the discharge of even more mineral nutrients leading to further deterioration in the already failing chemical status of all the watercourses within the TMBC area.</p> <p>In 2017 there was a KCC report looking at Kent's water (The Kent Water for Sustainable Growth Study) that suggested that each of the developing LPA Local Plans should take account of the current poor quality of Kent's water features and seek to prevent further deterioration and improve the quality of Kent's waters.</p> <p>"That study was completed at a strategic scale. As well as wastewater treatment and water resource capacity concerns, site specific analysis of infrastructure constraints should be considered as part of the Local Plan process in relation to sewerage and water supply networks. Whilst such infrastructure issues would be unlikely to limit development options, strategic level upgrades may be necessary in some locations where growth sites are numerous and total growth forecast is significant. As a result, there may be phasing limitations and developer contribution considerations for some growth locations." I cannot really see that TMBC's site appraisals have actually taken these factors into account in the site sustainability reports. This could, for example, have potential impacts on the waste water treatment being overwhelmed in areas such as my own, Hadlow, just as one example, where the capacity of the local plant is limited. What steps are TMBC taking to ensure that development at a local level will not exacerbate the existing difficulties in waste water treatment?</p> <p>This report also suggests that "all LPAs should consider adopting the Building Regulations optional standard for water use (110 l/p/d) as the preferred policy target for new development with respect to water efficiency. Each LPA could consider developing specific guidance on how developers can achieve this standard, and how to consider going further with the introduction of water recycling technologies." Has this option been specified within the proposed Local Plan in order to ensure that the overall level of development planned for TMBC does not make the situation worse?</p> <p>The report also suggests that "water supply companies should consider the option of enhanced programmes for retrofit of existing properties with water efficient fixtures and fittings within the 2019 WRMP updates. At a strategic level, the study has shown that, alongside adoption of policy for more stringent water efficient targets for new build, retrofitting of existing properties offers a means to (in part) address the current shortfalls in planned water supply to the end of the Local Plan period (2031). LPAs could consider supporting this as a joint initiative through facilitating adoption of measures within each Council's estate as well as providing programme management and resource to such an initiative." Have TMBC supported the delivery of this throughout its estate and further within the Borough over the recent period?</p> <p>Have TMBC considered supporting the development of "natural mitigation" of Kent's natural waters by both creating and restoring natural water features within the Local Plan for the district</p> <p>Our concerns are about the waste water aspects of the TMBC Local Plan and the quality of Kent's natural waters. We have to leave it to others to comment on whether the Local Plan adequately provides for other aspects such as the adequacy of the mains water supply to new developments within the Borough.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will also be preparing a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42684641	SA Report	4.29 Option 1 to maximize buildings in Tonbridge would be a better option as this would reduce carbon footprint. Developing villages with no train station and no very frequent bus services would not in the long term serve the borough well.	Comments noted.
42762433	SA Report	Where is the evidence that we need 16000 houses in a borough that is already overrun by housing with inadequate infrastructure. You cannot get an appointment with a GP for love nor money, there is not adequate water supply, power supply or sewage disposal as it is. There is no thought given when granting planning permission to improvement of surrounding roads etc. it is a disgrace.	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.
25315361	SA Report	A further limitation is that the existing Land Agricultural Classification System is not fit for purpose in regard to viticulture. At the time of the last Local Plan exercise there were few if any vineyards in the Borough. The acreage devoted to viticulture is currently growing exponentially. The potential revenue per acre and the scarcity of land suitable for viticulture greatly exceeds that for Grade 1 ALC land. The preservation of land for viticulture should have a greater priority than the preservation of grade 1 ALC land.	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42798817	SA Report	NB. In the 1990's my role at the Home Office was to produce guidance for all of the 10 x EU 2004 Accession Countries on their environmental legislation. This is because the EU thought that if the UK was happy with the legislation, then this would be the acceptable minimum. EU Local Agenda 21 and the Environmental Acquis is based on UK Environmental legislation.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42803809	SA Report	<p>Dear Sirs, I am here speaking on behalf of the volunteer pond wardens in Kent who are increasingly concerned about the quality of Kent's natural fresh waters, from both the public health and biodiversity points of view. We are concerned that inadequate provision has been made and continues to be made for waste water treatment in Local Planning, leading first to the discharge of untreated waste water into the natural environment and secondly, even if waste waters are adequately treated to convert the organic wastes to minerals, to the discharge of even more mineral nutrients leading to further deterioration in the already failing chemical status of all the watercourses within the TMBC area. In 2017 there was a KCC report looking at Kent's water (The Kent Water for Sustainable Growth Study) that suggested that each of the developing LPA Local Plans should take account of the current poor quality of Kent's water features and seek to prevent further deterioration and improve the quality of Kent's waters. ;That study was completed at a strategic scale. As well as wastewater treatment and water resource capacity concerns, site specific analysis of infrastructure constraints should be considered as part of the Local Plan process in relation to sewerage and water supply networks. Whilst such infrastructure issues would be unlikely to limit development options, strategic level upgrades may be necessary in some locations where growth sites are numerous and total growth forecast is significant. As a result, there may be phasing limitations and developer contribution considerations for some growth locations.; I cannot really see that TMBC's site appraisals have actually taken these factors into account in the site sustainability reports. This could, for example, have potential impacts on the waste water treatment being overwhelmed in areas such as my own, Hadlow, just as one example, where the capacity of the local plant is limited. What steps are TMBC taking to ensure that development at a local level will not exacerbate the existing difficulties in waste water treatment? This report also suggests that ;all LPAs should consider adopting the Building Regulations optional standard for water use (110 l/p/d) as the preferred policy target for new development with respect to water efficiency. Each LPA could consider developing specific guidance on how developers can achieve this standard, and how to consider going further with the introduction of water recycling technologies.; Has this option been specified within the proposed Local Plan in order to ensure that the overall level of development planned for TMBC does not make the situation worse? The report also suggests that ;water supply companies should consider the option of enhanced programmes for retrofit of existing properties with water efficient fixtures and fittings within the 2019 WRMP updates. At a strategic level, the study has shown that, alongside adoption of policy for more stringent water efficient targets for new build, retrofitting of existing properties offers a means to (in part) address the current shortfalls in planned water supply to the end of the Local Plan period (2031). LPAs could consider supporting this as a joint initiative through facilitating adoption of measures within each Council's estate as well as providing programme management and resource to such an initiative.; Have TMBC supported the delivery of this throughout its estate and further within the Borough over the recent period? Have TMBC considered supporting the development of ;natural mitigation; of Kent's natural waters by both creating and restoring natural water features within the Local Plan for the district Our concerns are about the waste water aspects of the TMBC Local Plan and the quality of Kent's natural waters. We have to leave it to others to comment on whether the Local Plan adequately provides for other aspects such as the adequacy of the mains water supply to new developments within the Borough.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Watercourse biodiversity will be considered within the Green Infrastructure Strategy and further evidence is being prepared on Climate Change adaptation.</p>
42052833	SA Report	<p>The Council was forced to withdraw the earlier Plan as the Inspector found that it had failed in its duty to co-operate with neighboring authorities as required by the NPPF and in particular the need to meet the shortfall in housing provision in Sevenoaks district. The NPPF is clear that any housing need not being met by neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for. This draft Plan is silent on what steps have been undertaken to co-operate with neighbouring authorities and how it is seeking to resolve the expected shortfall in housing provision at Sevenoaks. In this context, the proposed provision of 839 dwellings per year must be regarded as a minimum until such time as it is apparent that Sevenoaks Council will be meeting its own housing needs in full.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance and is working closely with all its neighbouring authorities through the duty-to-cooperate forum.</p>
42798817	SA Report	<p>Each of these areas should include an incentivisation plan/penalty plan to encourage changes in community behaviour which prioritises environmental protection (e.g. better/more incentives and financial support to insulate homes/ install ground source heat pumps/purchase rainwater collection tools/purchase EV vehicles and chargers etc etc) and which will lead to more environmental protection activities, as well as safeguarding the individual characteristics of the settlements.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42438273	SA Report	It would appear that Option 1 is the least detrimental of the 2 options. This is however on the assumption that wellbeing is improved by growth of population in more urban areas generating sufficient volume of people to make it viable to improve the infrastructure such as health provision to improve peoples experience. While this may occur - it is not a given and may well simply put further pressure on existing stretched infrastructure.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42052833	SA Report	This assessment is in our view very crude. It does not take account of the pressures that previous development has had on parts of the District, the difficulties involved with delivering major urban expansions and new settlements and the benefits that new development can have for smaller settlements. The Council faces a challenge in meeting the objectively assessed needs for housing, which in the case of Tonbridge & Malling amounts to 839 dwellings per annum or 15,941 dwellings across the plan period to 2040. It is vitally important that the Local Plan identifies a mixed portfolio of sites to provide opportunities for small and medium sized developers. The NPPF is clear that planning authorities should be providing a range of sites and that small and medium sized sites make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area. Sites should be identified adjacent to towns and villages across the settlement hierarchy. This would assist in supporting and enhancing local services and facilities. In this context, we do not believe that it is correct to continue to concentrate development just on the settlements beyond the Green Belt at Snodland and The Medway Gap as illustrated in Option 1. These areas have taken a huge amount of recent development and although they probably could accommodate more it would be unreasonable to concentrate all of the new development here. We do not believe that a new settlement as proposed by option 5 is viable. The lead in times for such projects are enormous and land assembly can be very complex. It is extremely doubtful that it could be achieved within the timeframe of the Local Plan. We consider that Option 4 of distributing development across the borough focusing on greenfield and previously developed land, rural service centres and other rural settlements presents the best overall strategy. Such an approach would allow for a sensible review of the Green Belt boundary in these areas and allow a limited but controlled expansion of those settlements that could accommodate additional growth, both for housing and employment. For instance, we believe that the built-up area of Addington should be extended to include the residential areas comprising The Links and Humphries Park Mitsubushi. It should also be extended southwards across the A20 down to the railway to include site 59604/59606.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.
42438273	SA Report	Options 3, 4 and 5 appear to be particularly negative in their impact and I would not therefore support any of these. All options with the possible exception of Option 1 are likely to fundamentally change the nature of the area in a detrimental way.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.
42387809	SA Report	Tonbridge needs mor people in the town centre to keep it alive, as offered in Option 1	Comment noted.
42438273	SA Report	Option 1 would appear to be a little less negative than option 2.	Comment noted.
42438273	SA Report	It is quite difficult for the lay person to understand what each of these options actually mean. Personally, I would not like to reduce the green belt and would not like to merge West Malling, Kings Hill and East Malling into one large dwelling area with no greenspace between it.	Comment noted.
42798817	SA Report	I understand the pressure to build houses, however, these cannot be built without the corresponding increased capacity in school/hospitals/doctors/dentists and other community resources.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42716609	SA Report	The sites located in Leybourne are all small green spaces used for recreational purposes, exercise and dog walking. These are all vitally important to the community and if they were to be built on then the area would have very little appeal to residents. Leybourne is already very well developed and the green spaces proposed to be developed are widely used. Specifically sites 59456, 59432, 59441, and 59445 all are heavily depended upon green spaces for the residents and are part of what makes Leybourne a great village to live in. Residents of leybourne strongly object to any development within our village.	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42610977	Annex 1	Hi Good Afternoon My name is [Redacted]and I live with my family in East Peckham about 6 years. I like peace and quiet here and I love to walk around the village with my kids. I just want to say NO for new buildings in Hale Street sites 59855 59782 and 59660. Here is some examples of why I don't want new houses. Narrow lane Site is in flood zone 2and	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		3 Roads between the village and the side flood. There is no railway closes by. The village has no GP. High ground water level mean the use of soakaway likely unsuitable for this area. Side is green belt area.	
42059873	Annex 1	I object to the fact that sites near the village of Eccles have been wrongly classified as being close to healthcare facilities. All healthcare facilities are scheduled to relocate to Peters Village long before the Local Plan will be adopted. Those facilities will not be accessible by public transport.I object to the fact that some sites near the village of Eccles have been classified as being accessible to a bus stop. A bus stop is of little consequence without a basic daily bus service. The bus service has been reduced to two return journeys per week. It is insufficient to support travel for employment. It only allows two visits a week to Maidstone and the turnaround time is too short to realistically permit many activities (such dental appointments, bank interviews or eye tests). Public transport journeys into and then beyond Maidstone are not feasible since there is no possibility of a return journey.I request that the sites near the village of Eccles should be reappraised for their accessibility status under SA2 in light of any changes undertaken in response to the forgoing objections.	As explained in the full Interim SA Report (paras 2.38 and D.2), the site assessment criteria include a number of distance-based criteria used to estimate the likely effects of site options. A number of the appraisal assumptions refer to accessibility from site options to services, facilities, employment, etc. There are a number of pieces of research that give a variety of recommended guidance distances for walking. For example, the Institute of Highways and Transportation found that the average length of a walk journey is one kilometre. Further to this, it categorises distances depending upon the location and purpose of the trip, as 'desirable', 'acceptable' or 'preferred maximum'. Given the wide range of services and facilities normally considered in SAs, LUC has developed some guideline distances that it uses in its SA work, and which are therefore reflected in the site assessment criteria
42140737	Annex 1	You must leave the last remaining open spaces on kings hill alone. The two green spaces along Tower View are for the children of the estate please, there's already issues with youths. Leave the kids some green open space.	Comment noted.
42329793	Annex 1	A neighbour has alerted myself and neighbours about the local plan... I am disgusted to even see that Brindlesfield play area would even be a consideration. It's the only play area this end of town (are you really going to take the only play area away , even though there will be more children in the area). To build along Chaucer gardens would also be ridiculously it would be so close to people's properties, not acceptable!!!! To plan to build on green belt land was beyond ridiculous and shows how the council no longer care about there town.To keep trying to build this end of town will make it over crowded, parking is already crazy due to college and schools , even buses often struggle getting up this way due to parking To build on top of people's homes like this is unacceptable!! It's about time the council started looking out of town instead of ruining people's lives by building on top if their homes.South Tonbridge is already feeling cramped. With the plans you already have it won't be long before South Tonbridge comes to a standstill.Gone are the days were play areas were very important to the local council.Why was permission given for the new units on the old royal mail site, that was a large site and would've been perfect for many apartments and not on top of people's homes!!There are other areas you could look at out of town . We will fight to keep this play area Infront of our homes. It's not necessary to build so close to residents homes there are other areas!!! You do cover malling aswell. It does feel like Tonbridge is taking a large bulk of these builds and your ruining what was once a nice town. If you built more outside of towns people wouldn't object so much to new builds. It about time you started looking at the impacts on residents rather than easy options .I really hope this area will be taken off the plan	Comment noted.
42213665	Annex 1	Re: Site numbers 59740 and 59740The development of large and medium sized sites on land which is currently used for agricultural purposes should be avoided. Reasons for this include securing national food production capability, maintaining biodiversity, reducing flood risk, reducing greenhouse gases, maintaining green corridors between settlements and preventing urban sprawl.Re: Site numbers 59824,59698,59743,59726, 59631,59636The development of sites which are currently large areas open /green space should be opposed to prevent urban sprawl which will have the effect of merging separate and distinct locales. Development of the above-mentioned sites would be particularly damaging and lead to the potential creation of one continuous urban spaces linking East Malling, West Malling, Kings Hill, Wateringbury, Leybourne and Larkfield.Re: Site numbers 59634,59655,59807,59814In my opinion there should be no further northward development of Kings Hill for the same reason.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42444161	Annex 1	56971- one of its proposals dictates that as the site is within a certain distance to a train station, it could be viewed as a positive option for development on eco grounds however I don't feel enough account has been taken in the amount of trees which will be lost, which are the very thing which will help with emissions	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42444929	Annex 1	Site number 59616In response to the proposed site being built on for an industrial unit I object on the following grounds:The site floods, the site is green belt, real risk of water displacement back to residential houses when it floods. Destruction of wildlife habitat. Removal of trees also increases risk of flooding local area.Already have industrial units that are empty and available for lease in EP, so no need for more units!!	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42446849	Annex 1	I am against this planning, due to potential flood-risk this will pose on the area.	Comment noted.
42469089	Annex 1	Further to the meeting at Borough Green ,attended by the head of Tonbridge and malling planning department and local parish councillors. I must say I was very disappointed at the locals turn out considering we are all against new development ! There are around 6000 residents but only the usual ones turn up approximately 40 people . If people are so against this local plan in BG then there shouldn't of been any standing room.The parish council have arrange for templates of answers they believe should answer these so called questions on this article 18 local plan consultation. This is not appropriate I believe and it's not a honest opinion of the people. They do not like change and are constantly against any new developments. This is why no new housing has been built . I'd be interested in knowing actually the number of new houses built in the last 2 years in the district of Tonbridge and Malling. No one want new homes on there door step but borough green really does have a lot going for it !1 Great train service to London with a new service starting December so that we can now travel to London Victoria, London Bridge , Charring Cross , Blackfriars. It was funny that BG meeting showed a packed train in India and that he'd felt our train service was like this for his commute to London. To be realistic commuters only really commute twice a week and more people than ever now work from home .2 Great road links on our door step . 3 A secondary School which is building a new school on the same site which will be able to increase numbers of pupils . This wasn't mentioned at all .4 The need for first time homes / flats . Even a supported living accommodation for our elderly.5 The BG surgery has room to extend if more homes were built . Etc etcThe head of planning Matt mentioned that Tonbridge would be ideal to put more homes as they have the infrastructure, but then in another breathe ... Tonbridge floods !It would be great to see green belt and ANOB lines move, it's incredible that ugly looking sand pits etc are in this class. We need to grow and create a great place to live for us and our children. .	Comment noted.
42469729	Annex 1	1s1To all sites in East Peckham, these are not sustainable or suitable. The area is a rural settlement and does not have the facilities to support the growth. In addition it is green belt land that is risk of flooding. 1I would like to draw particular attention to sites on Hale Street; s159650, s159782, s159855. 1I live on Hale Street the and the proposed developments would have a significant impact on my home. My house connects to site 59855 but is 1 metre lower than the surface level (we have steps up in the garden). Should this be built on their would be an increase risk of flooding which is already high. We have to buy specialist insurance due to the current flood risk. In addition, the site has an oil pipe within the ground that restricts building. All 3 sites negatively impact the environment, displacing animals and development would not enrich the area. These sites are not suitable, however should they be considered further we would need to be directly consulted as they all have significant negative impact to us.	Comment noted.
42470113	Annex 1	Regarding sites: 59650, 59782 & 59855I oppose these lands being used for development for the following reasons:- high chance of flooding in the area- the area is already a flood plane and this will impact both current and (if these plans proceed) future residents and businesses. - significant negative impacts on local residents. Roads are already too busy, not enough shops, GPS schools etc. - East Peckham is a rural settlement without the infrastructure to support large developments.Please do not add further pressure to an already overflowing area.	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.
25315361	Annex 1	If I am reading the map correctly, site 59381 is currently part of a vineyard. All land suitable for viticulture in the Borough should be reserved for that purpose. Such land is relatively rare and would typically expect to have an economic value in terms of revenue per acre which exceeds that of Grade 1 agricultural land.Site 59381 is prominently visible from the North Downs AONB.	Comment noted.
42511361	Annex 1	Site ID: 59720I strongly object to this development as the proposed entrance at Fen Pond Road is unsuitable due to the following:a. Fen Pond Road is too narrow and speed that vehicles travel down the road would increase the potential for accidents.b. There is no pavement or walkways to the centre of the village, schools or transport links c. The development of 198 houses could create c400 cars, Fen Pond Road is unsuitable for that volume of vehicles.d. the development area is surrounding by woodland is within an AONB.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42511361	Annex 1	Site ID: 59793I object to the development outlined above.This development does not support my preferred Option 1in the strategic plan. The development would impact woodland area and is within the boundaries of an AONB so should not be considered.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42511361	Annex 1	Site ID: 59872 & 59871I strongly object to the two proposed developments above.Both of these developments would enter and exit via Fen Pond Road. Fen Pond Road is too narrow and speed that vehicles travel along the road would increase the potential for accidents.The entrance/exit is close to an historic building Ightham Church and housing would not be appropriate to this location.The development is also in an AONB.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42407553	Annex 1	Safe Cycle path from west Malling to Tonbridge town centre and another to Twells. Let's encourage folks out of their cars.	Comment noted.
42589889	Annex 1	Site ID:I object to the development outlined above.This development would impact woodland area and is within the boundaries of an AONB so should not be considered.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42589889	Annex 1	Site ID: 59871 & 59872I strongly object to the two proposed developments above.Both of these developments would enter and exit via Fen Pond Road. Fen Pond Road is too narrow and the speed that vehicles travel along would increase the potential for accidents. The entrance /exit is close to the historic building of Ightham church and housing would not be appropriate to this location.The development is also in an AONB so should not e considered.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42594625	Annex 1	I am against local planning - Regulation 18 forRev: 59876 Rev: 59837Rev: 59613As most land around us in Snollhatch floods and comes under the conservation area, it is definitely not suitable to go ahead with any new buildings. We have to remember we are a village and work hard to protect our beautiful surroundings and all the natural habitat that we share it with.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42604513	Annex 1	Comments in relation to Proposed development: site 59525I purchased my property in Westwood Road in East Peckham with a huge factor of the surroundings. The road is near the edge of the village with orchards and footpaths. We liked the green outside the house as it leaves a nice open space to the area. Our garden is east facing meaning the sun sets out to the front of our property which is west facing. With development out on this area, it would take light from the front of our property which actually results in the front of our house being warm by the natural elements in sunny days. The last thing we would want as owner of this property is to overlook built up houses or flats. parking is a big concern in this road with about a third of the properties having driveways, leaving less room for households to park on the road. People often resort to half parking on the green to bring their cars more off the road. Currently cars have to park so close together, it has always been a concern for emergency vehicles getting through. When driving through you can slowly edge a car at times but if an ambulance or fire engine had to drive along they would encounter difficulties. The arch in the road makes parking difficult and will only get worse with more residents if a build is agreed.Their is community spirit at times throughout the year including use of the green, this comes from orchestral performances from the local Salvation Army, children playing, people chatting, walking dogs and this summer fitness classes being held in the green. Building on this site would take this community spirit away.East Peckham is a high risk flood area and although I do not believe this road has flooded it has been cut off to one end and the other end being cut of due to huge floods within the village. Taking away established trees which are on the green, along with the grasses area will take away natural soak away areas to a broom that runs along Westwood Road resulting in an increased risk of flooding to the tea of these properties that edge the brook.I would also like to point out the extra traffic that would be caused within the whole village which is already an issue around the local shops and the local primary school, increasing the risk of potential danger. The area is not street lit. The nearby train station is a 45 minute walk, with Jo street lighting, no pathway and is very dangerous. This station also has no parking. The next station has parking but it would add traffic to another village that has also been subject to extra building development. Local bus services are constantly being threatened with cuts to services or complete elimination which would make the village more isolated, with no access to two nearby hospitals or the nearest GP surgeries as there is not one on the village or a dental practice.I therefore oppose any development to the area, but particularly to this proposed site.	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.
42590337	Annex 1	Site 59837As commented on the larger site 59613:-Access is poor onto a narrow road with poor turning and poor visuals.The area identified is higher than the surrounding roads and properties. When we had flooding in East Peckham this entire site was a 'lake'. Snoll Hatch Road had become a river- deep, impassable and fast flowing. If this site was used for housing, all the water that was held back would now have nowhere to go, so would add to the	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		torrent in the road. So causing flood damage to more properties in surrounding houses and into the village centre. This has been a recurring issue twice since so is now more than 1 in 30 year occurrence.	
42610113	Annex 1	Site 59782 - TOTAL OBJECTIONThe plot is Greenbelt and is directly behind the cottages know as Orchard Court. A privately owned set of 7 dwellings know as Orchard Court Residents Association. Building on this plot of greenbelt land will cause increased traffic on what is already a narrow and busy road. Increased fumes and pollution. Traffic already makes my property shake and has caused cracks. Also I would also like to make the following points: The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. The roads to the station flood. There is no parking at nearest station. Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system. Site is Green belt land, as mentioned above. Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream. Roads between the village and the site flood. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no rail station close by. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The village has no GP Surgery. Finding out about this planning is causing me to have high anxiety about the future - to include my health and value of my home. I purchased my property in the location on purpose as I knew that the land around / behind is Greenbelt. I understand you have a quota to complete annually, but this is not a location that would would benefit, more so this would be detrimental to the local properties and indeed the village. Please do not let this proceed.	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.
42469729	Annex 1	Hale St sites 59855, 59650 and 59782 These sites should not be considered for development for the following reasons: Sites are located on a flood plain. Roads between the village and the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream, with houses built in the area currently on lower ground area. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. narrow lanes and a road network that cannot support more traffic. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	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.
25408257	Annex 1	Regarding Development sites on Snoll Hatch and Addlestead sites 59613, 59876 and 59837. All 3 sites are and Most of East Peckham are completely unacceptable and inappropriate for development for the following Narrow lanes, unsuitable for large equipment and high traffic. Existing Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area, any new build houses will damage and devalue the asthetic of the existing properties. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	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.
42613569	Annex 1	The roads to the station flood. There is no parking at nearest station. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area, any new build houses will damage and devalue the asthetic of the existing properties. Site is Green belt land. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. All roads to the site flood. Poor accessibility. Narrow lanes, unsuitable for large equipment and high traffic. Existing Parking problems. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no rail station close by. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. Regarding Development sites on Snoll Hatch and Addlestead sites 59613, 59876 and 59837. All 3 sites are completely unacceptable and inappropriate for development for the following reasons: The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	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.
42615681	Annex 1	We need these houses our children have to move away and all the reasons for not building are feeble	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42632609	Annex 1	Site 59646This entire area is a flood plain providing essential drainage for a massive area. To build here would be absolute madness and a genuine threat to surrounding areas.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42632609	Annex 1	Site 59646This site provides much needed access to nature for local residents. To build this close to the river would be detrimental to the lives of those who love in the area. Intensive agriculture has already reduced woodland in this area to a fraction of what it should be, building here would be devastating to local wildlife.These woods also host the endangered nightingale on its migration path. Any attempt to build here would certainly mean we never see these birds again.	Comment noted.
42594849	Annex 1	Regarding development sites on Snoll Hatch and Addlestead 59613, 59876 and 59837.These sites are inappropriate for development due to the following:All roads to the sites flood. We have lived on Snoll Hatch Road for 11 years and have witnessed flooding in the village including Snoll Hatch Road and Addlestead Road. The sites are in flood zones 2 and 3.Snoll Hatch is a character area. New build houses will severely affect the aesthetic of existing buildings and de-value these considerably. The site is green belt land. Snoll Hatch is a hamlet and must be kept separate from East Peckham. Building on this site goes against established anti-coalescence policy. There are already parking problems and the narrow roads are unsuitable for high traffic, heavy machinery and large equipment. There is poor accessibility. Snoll Hatch Road will not be able to stand the volume of traffic. The village has no GP surgery, limited public transport and no rail station nearby. The roads to the station flood and there is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.	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.
42648289	Annex 1	As with the majority of East Peckham residents, my concerns about the planned proposals include:The site(s) in question are in a flood zone. Vast areas of East Peckham regularly floods, removing more 'soakaway' land and replacing it with concrete will have a direct impact on existing residential dwellings creating even more flood areas than there are already.The river Bourne and a number of tributary streams run through the village. Increased building on and around these areas will impact flows and will potentially cause additional, chaotic and unprecedented flood risk - on top of the already high-flood risk that the village lives with.Many areas are not accessible by flood wardens, making loss of life during floods more likely.Final point is probably not even worth mentioning anymore, but this is designated 'green belt' land. Please consider all brown field sites before using this crucial green belt land for housing.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42649025	Annex 1	I am writing to opposed the proposed development of 2 plots of land in Hale Street ref 59782 and 59650 near to the Brookside Garden Centre end. Namely due to over population in area, flooding, GP facilities are not large enough and the school is not large enough.	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.
42661473	Annex 1	Site ref 59646. I cannot see how this land is an appropriate site for more housing/industrial units. It is an area that has flooded in the recent past resulting in many animals at the Hop Farm losing their lives. The immediate area and amenities already under pressure with two large developments at Foal Hurst Green and Mascalls	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42583393	Annex 1	Site 59811the listed Historic parkland is not shown on the map for this site,the listed area will be reduced by over 60% of the land.Historic England list no; 1001355As mentioned in my email regarding this site :The roads surrounding it are mostly single track only passing another vehicle by going onto grass verge, impossible to pass tractors and trucks . Reversing around often blind bends to let them pass. Tractors with trailers cannot reverse.Hadlow has tiny primary school with no room to develop, a doctors surgery that cannot take any patients and no space to develop and much of the time you cannot get through the village as is gridlocked.No parking provision near shops and poor bus service to the towns.No secondary school, no train station.Very dangerous to cycle through the village. Site area has dreadful internet and phone service.No way to improve access to Hadlow Road without compulsory purchase of two private houses and the recent Travellers site at the road junction.Greensand Way runs though the site on the listed land.	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.
42714561	Annex 1	Site 59761Objections to residential dwellings for the following reasons:1) the closest primary school to this site is currently oversubscribed and further development will impact on dwellings built on this site2) the doctors surgery located less than half a mile away currently cannot deal with demand & is crippled. Further development will be detrimental to an already poor health care service3) building more houses does not support climate change so this needs to be shown as a negative impact. 4) The volume of traffic using the A228 is already beyond capacity - access for vehicles coming onto the A228 from Kate Reed Wood and the Airfield Estate are dangerous. Due to the volume it makes pulling out of these roads almost impossible in peak periods. Frustrated drivers then take risks and move into the middle of the carriageway which having witnessed on several occasions has caused near misses. Further	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		development will only further increase traffic levels which will further increase the risk of accidents and danger to pedestrians. School children are currently at risk having to cross an extremely busy road with no traffic calming or crossing measures in place. An increase in traffic caused by further development will increase this risk. 5) the proposed sites for redevelopment exceed the current level of housing that already exists in Kings Hill/West Malling - how can this current application be supported? The impact on climate change, the environment and human mental health & well being will be significantly impacted in a negative way if this site is developed.	
42096289	Annex 1	Site 59646This site is almost entirely flood zone 3 and acts as a very important flood plain for East Peckham. Should this land be developed it would have severe consequences for the village as huge amounts of floodwater would be displaced into the village. Flooding is so severe in this area there is significant risk of loss of life. Both sides of the river burst their banks and surrounding areas become a raging torrent up to four feet deep. As a local flood warden I very much object to development upon site 59646. The footpaths and surrounding land on both sides of the Medway as it flows through East Peckham can be a very dangerous place to be.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42096289	Annex 1	Site 59813This site is both green belt and grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. Access to this site is from Church Lane which suffers regular flooding. All other nearby lanes are very narrow and flood extensively leaving site 59813 isolated and inaccessible during flooding. As a local flood warden I strongly object to development of this land. Not only would any new community be at risk but existing properties, both nearby and downstream, would have increased flood risk due to development.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42096289	Annex 1	Site 59616As a local flood warden I very strongly object to development on this land. The site is flood zone 3, directly adjacent to the Medway and on its convergence with another watercourse. During flooding it is a very dangerous area for people to be. Loss of life is a very real prospect in this area as land both sides of the Medway becomes a raging torrent of deep floodwater. Further, the flooding from the village of East Peckham caused by the Medway further upstream drains away and re-enters the Medway at the direct location of site 59616. Any construction or ground raising upon this land would block the flow of escaping water and displace that floodwater back into the village to increase flooding of surrounding roads and properties. Medway Meadows would be especially at risk. A cul-de-sac of 32 houses, many of which already flood, and is located directly opposite site 59616The kind of lighting normally used for employment and industrial sites would be completely unsuitable on site 59616. It directly overlooks family homes and rear gardens and both light and noise pollution would significantly negatively affect many residents quality of life. There must be many more suitable sites for employment within the borough, rather than site 59616, which sits in arguably the most flood prone and dangerous location in the entire borough. Nearby properties and residents are trapped by the Medway to South and the East, Bourne to the West and Coult to the North and suffer the worst flooding in the Borough. Any development on this site would only worsen that flooding.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42716609	Annex 1	The sites located in Leybourne are all small green spaces used for recreational purposes, exercise and dog walking. These are all vitally important to the community and if they were to be built on then the area would have very little appeal to residents. Leybourne is already very well developed and the green spaces proposed to be developed are widely used. Specifically sites 59456, 59432, 59441, and 59445 all are heavily depended upon green spaces for the residents and are part of what makes Leybourne a great village to live in. Residents of leybourne strongly object to any development within our village.	Comment noted.
42720769	Annex 1	Re sites 59639, 59640 and 59753Bush Road is very narrow, prone to flooding, unlit, has no pavements and limited visibility due to the bends. There is already a dangerous level of traffic speeding along the road with 2 cars struggling to pass. Our own fence has been hit by cars a number times as well as the adjacent electricity transformer and gas main. The sites are prime agricultural land. Any additional homes will exacerbate an already dangerous situation.Re site 69813This is a huge development site on prime agricultural land / green belt and would overwhelm the existing limited infrastructure and facilities (eg no GP surgery). Church Lane is already a very busy road with a dangerous junction onto Bush Road. Flooding is an issue for the area	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721057	Annex 1	Site Number 59613 Should not be developed for the following reasons: Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement There is a large drainage ditch for water that runs all the way along the end of the gardens of Westwood Road, between Westwood and this proposed development area, this ditch fills up even with the field currently as a field. Houses on this land would lead to nowhere else for the flood water to go and properties could be flooded.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721057	Annex 1	Site Number 59876 Should not be developed for the following reasons: Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement There is a large drainage ditch for water that runs all the way along the end of the gardens of Westwood Road, between Westwood and this proposed development area, this ditch fills up even with the field currently as a field. Houses on this land would lead to nowhere else for the flood water to go and properties could be flooded.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721057	Annex 1	Site Number 59837 Should not be developed for the following reasons: Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement There is a large drainage ditch for water that runs all the way along the end of the gardens of Westwood Road, between Westwood and this proposed development area, this ditch fills up even with the field currently as a field. Houses on this land would lead to nowhere else for the flood water to go and properties could be flooded.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721217	Annex 1	Site 59525 This site should be designated a green space. Developing the site would be detrimental to health and well-being of the community. This site is regularly used by the community for singing groups, keep fit sessions, parades, Salvation Army events, football, children playing, a place to sit and be within nature, dog walking, a place to meet and socialise, a place for those with no gardens, a safe place to meet in an emergency, a place for the air ambulance to land (anything else you can think of) Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc). Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream. Site is Green belt land. Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas. Water pressure problems. Water meter problems. Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight. Would destroy mature trees. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement it is a safe space for local children to play where no main roads need to be crossed it is used for exercise by many older residence with mobility issues this is a community space and used by all ages for many occasions such as christmas, jubilee and remembrance day	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721057	Annex 1	The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land. When we moved into the village in the year 2000 the whole village flooded just before Christmas. The flood water came from the Hop Farm and flowed down Pinkham then along the main road. Then, the water also flowed from Branbridges and back along the main road to join up with the water from Pinkham. People were trapped in the Crown Acres Estate and couldn't get out for three days!. The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village. Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstream. The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3. Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding. During flooding there is significant risk of loss of life in this area. East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721217	Annex 1	Site 59613 Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. there is a large water drainage ditch which removes a lot of water from the area which is not identified on this plan	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721217	Annex 1	Site 59837 Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721217	Annex 1	Site 59876 Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721217	Annex 1	Site 59646 The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land. The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village. Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstream. The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3. Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding. During flooding there is significant risk of loss of life in this area. East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		risking life. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	
42721057	Annex 1	Westwood Rd, site 59525 This site should be designated a green space. Developing the site would be detrimental to health and well-being of the community. This site is regularly used by the community for singing groups, keep fit sessions, parades, Salvation Army events, football, children playing, a place to sit and be within nature, dog walking, a place to meet and socialise, a place for those with no gardens, a safe place to meet in an emergency, a place for the air ambulance to land. It is a safe place for children from Westwood to play and stay within safe view of parents. Narrow lanes. My son (age 6) says 'I play with my remote control cars out on the green' 'I play with Oscar from nextdoor with his remote control planes and cars' Parking problems are already an issue with many houses in Westwood Road having multiple vehicles and no driveways. Of an evening, when everyone is home from work the road is so full of parked cars that an emergency vehicle would not fit through. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc). Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream. Site is Green belt land. Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas. Water pressure problems. Water meter problems. Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight. Would destroy mature trees. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should definitely be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement, we do not have the community facilities to be a rural service centre.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42561377	Annex 1	1s1Comments on Site Number 59770 2s2This development proposal is inappropriate for a number of reasons: 1 The site has been used as agricultural land for many years. There has been a flock of sheep in the field since before we moved to the area 10 years ago. Any development on the site would not only result in the loss of agricultural land but would also extend the village boundary into the green belt and fundamentally change the character of the area. The site is partly situated in a flood zone. We experience the practical implications of this most years. After periods of heavy rain, the run-off from the field merges with surface water from further up Rectory Lane and eventually breaches the entrance to our driveway and then floods the garage. The rainwater also causes the drainage below the development site on the A25 to overflow and the pressure eventually lifts the manhole cover at the junction of Rectory Lane and the A25. This results in raw sewage being deposited across the road. The proposed development must surely exacerbate this in two ways. Firstly, the additional houses will place a burden on the already failing drainageApple-converted-space and secondly, the introduction of a significant amount of impermeable surface area will worsen the flooding. The problem is likely to get worse during the planning period with the effects of climate change. The development will have an adverse effect on local community services i.e. the primary school, medical and transport services. The issue with the school is discussed in the SA. The medical services provided by Borough Green Medical Centre are already overloaded. GP appointments can be difficult to get and the car park is often full at peak times. Whilst the development site is a short walk from a bus-stop, the bus services are considered inadequate due to their infrequency. Although the proposal does not contain a road layout, it seems inevitable that it would introduce traffic problems. Rectory Lane is a narrow, single-track road which is unfortunately used as a cut-through between the A25 and A227. Additional traffic in the Lane would be a nightmare. The area around the site is already an accident black spot.The nearby busy junction between Oldbury Lane, Sevenoaks Road and the A25 has been the scene of a number of accidents. At drop-off and pick-up times for the school there is usually a queue of traffic waiting on the A25 to turn right into the car-park. This is directly opposite the proposed site. Adding another exit onto the A25 into this mix would be dangerous.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	Site 59646 The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land. The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village. Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstream. The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3. Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding. During flooding there is significant risk of loss of life in this area. East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Site 59613 Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Site 59876 Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Sites 59837 Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Sites 59747, 59806 and 59846 Very narrow lanes between East Peckham and the sites. Two vehicles often struggle pass each other. Many roads to the site flood. The A26 floods Sites fall into flood zones 2 and 3. Sites include grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The sites are in the catchment area for the Coult Stream and Boroughs Oak Stream, both of which already regularly flood parts of East Peckham. Any surface water discharge from these sites will increase flood risk in East Peckham. Site is Green belt land. Site 59806 completely overwhelms two important heritage assets. If site 59806 is developed, no development should happen east of the A228 (Seven Mile Lane) to protect these assets. Views both of and from St Michaels Church will be ruined. If site 59806 is developed, a strong boundary of green belt must be maintained between it and Peckham Bush. An ancient pilgrimage trail runs through the sites. There is no rail station within 3 miles. Roads to the nearest two stations flood. There is no parking at Beltring station. The Parish of East Peckham has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	Sites 59789 and 59682 Narrow lanes. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. A main river, the Coult Stream, runs through the site and regularly floods. Any surface water discharge from these sites will flood property downstream. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Sites 59639, 59640 and 59753 Very narrow lanes in the area. Two vehicles often struggle to pass each other. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zone 1. Bush Rd floods. All roads to the site flood. Bush Rd is unlit with no pavements. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways may be unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Anti coalescence, the Hamlet of Peckham Bush must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is an animal sanctuary very close by. There is an ancient pilgrimage trail passing through. There are many heritage assets within 250 metres. Site is grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The proposed new town on the A26 will cause further flooding to watercourses in the area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Site 59525 - "lh Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc). Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream. Site is Green belt land. Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas. Water pressure problems. Water meter problems. Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight. Would destroy mature trees. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Site 59616 Site is in flood zone 3. Roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. This is the exact point where flooding in Pinkham, Old Rd, Hale St (south), Branbridges and Medway Meadows leaves the village and returns to the Medway River. Development of the site could significantly increase flooding locally. The location of this site is unsuitable for type of lighting associated with employment units. The site overlooks residential properties and rear gardens. The site has a main River, the Medway, directly on its boundary. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. Anti coalescence policy, Branbridges estate must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Sites 59855, 59650 and 59872 Narrow lanes. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Roads between the village and the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Site 69813 Narrow lanes. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site can be isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Surface water discharge from this site could flood property downstream. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. The CLH fuel pipeline system runs through this site. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at the nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	Sites 59855, 59650 and 5978 Narrow lanes. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Roads between the village and the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Site 59813 Narrow lanes. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site can be isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Surface water discharge from this site could flood property downstream. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. The CLH fuel pipeline system runs through this site. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at the nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723265	Annex 1	Site 59646 The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land. The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village. Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstream. The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3. Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding. During flooding there is significant risk of loss of life in this area. East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723265	Annex 1	Sites 59613, 59876 and 59837 Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a Character Area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723265	Annex 1	Sites 59747, 59806 and 59846 = "jh Very narrow lanes between East Peckham and the sites. Two vehicles often struggle pass pass each other. Many roads to the site flood. The A26 floods Sites fall into flood zones 2 and 3. Sites include grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The sites are in the catchment area for the Coult Stream and Boroughs Oak Stream, both of which already regularly flood parts of East Peckham. Any surface water discharge from these sites will increase flood risk in East Peckham. Site is Green belt land. Site 59806 completely overwhelms two important heritage assets. If site 59806 is developed, no development should happen east of the A228 (Seven Mile Lane) to protect these assets. Views both of and from St Michaels Church will be ruined. If site 59806 is developed, a strong boundary of green belt must be maintained between it and Peckham Bush. An ancient pilgrimage trail runs through the sites. There is no rail station within 3 miles. Roads to the nearest two stations flood. There is no parking at Beltring station. The Parish of East Peckham has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	Sites 59789 and 59682 Narrow lanes. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. A main river, the Coult Stream, runs through the site and regularly floods. Any surface water discharge from these sites will flood property downstream. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723265	Annex 1	Sites 59639, 59640 and 59753 Very narrow lanes in the area. Two vehicles often struggle to pass each other. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zone 1. Bush Rd floods. All roads to the site flood. Bush Rd is unlit with no pavements. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways may be unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Anti coalescence , the Hamlet of Peckham Bush must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is an animal sanctuary very close by. There is an ancient pilgrimage trail passing through. There are many heritage assets within 250 metres. Site is grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The proposed new town on the A26 will cause further flooding to watercourses in the area. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723265	Annex 1	Site 59525 This site should be designated a green space. Developing the site would be detrimental to health and well-being of the community. This site is regularly used by the community for singing groups, keep fit sessions, parades, Salvation Army events, football, children playing, a place to sit and be within nature, dog walking, a place to meet and socialise, a place for those with no gardens, a safe place to meet in an emergency, a place for the air ambulance to land (anything else you can think of) Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc). Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream. Site is Green belt land. Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas. Water pressure problems. Water meter problems. Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight. Would destroy mature trees. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723265	Annex 1	Site 59616 =":pr Site is in flood zone 3. Roads to the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. This is the exact point where flooding in Pinkham, Old Rd, Hale St (south), Branbridges and Medway Meadows leaves the village and returns to the Medway River. Development of the site could significantly increase flooding locally. The location of this site is unsuitable for type of lighting associated with employment units. The site overlooks residential properties and rear gardens. The site has a main River, the Medway, directly on its boundary. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. Anti coalescence policy, Branbridges estate must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723265	Annex 1	Sites 59855, 59650 and 59782Narrow lanes.Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.Roads between the village and the site flood.Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream.High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area.Site is Green belt land.Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system.There is no rail station close by.There is no parking at nearest station.There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.The roads to the station flood.The village has no GP Surgery.The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	Site 69813 Narrow lanes. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site can be isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Surface water discharge from this site could flood property downstream. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. The CLH fuel pipeline system runs through this site. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at the nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723041	Annex 1	Site 59525 This site should be designated a green space. Developing the site would be detrimental to health and well-being of the community. This site is regularly used by the community for singing groups, keep fit sessions, parades, Salvation Army events, football, children playing, a place to sit and be within nature, dog walking, a place to meet and socialise, a place for those with no gardens, a safe place to meet in an emergency, a place for the air ambulance to land (anything else you can think of) Narrow lanes. Parking problems. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc). Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream. Site is Green belt land. Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas. Water pressure problems. Water meter problems. Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight. Would destroy mature trees. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42727329	Annex 1	We would like to register our objection to the following sites: 59701 (10.79 ha), 9661 (7.11 ha), 59834 (63.39 ha).Your own reports highlight the significant challenges in delivering these sites due to flood risk, impact to environment, detriment to green belt, and proximity to historical assets, all of which we agree with, and make it clear that these are simply not viable options.In addition; one element that the reports don't accurately reflect is the non reversible damage that would be done to one of Tonbridge's key assets which is Postern Lane and the public footpath that runs along it.As a lane resident we observe the large number of local Tonbridge residents that use this footpath through out the week, enjoying access to the open countryside that is right on Tonbridge's doorstep, stopping and taking in the number of historical houses that sit on the road.Developing the above sites would irrevocably damage the character of this area, and materially impact the enjoyment and value so many of Tonbridge's wider residents take from this walk. We respect the need for development and growth, but if the recent pandemic and lockdowns have taught us anything, it should be to respect and cherish our local areas that bring so much mental well being to so many, and not spoil them forever more with industrial buildings.It would a sad day if decisions were made to prioritise putting a discount carpet warehouse or car garage in direct line of site of some of Tonbridge's most significant historical assets that have stood for 3-400years.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38927393	Annex 1	I am responding on behalf of Plaxtol Parish Council. We have looked at the sites put forward in Plaxtol parish and also ones bordering our parish or nearby ones which will have an impact on the primary school, medical centres in Borough Green, Hadlow and Tonbridge and the roads. These include ID nos: 59774, 59778, 59862, 59830, 59709, 59720, 59677, 59773, 59877, 59767, 59748, 59608, 59811, 59776, 59842, 50608, 59770, 59779, 59827 and 59825. For all these proposed sites we cannot definitively agree or disagree with the Borough Council's comments because there are no details of the infrastructure that would persuade us and our parishioners to accept the proposals. By this I mean no detail on how the roads will cope with the extra traffic; what provision for schools (both primary and secondary) have been built in for the increase in school children and students; what plans have been discussed for existing medical centres to manage the increase in patients or for new centres to be built; and barely any mention of climate change and environmental impact on each of the sites and how the Council intends to mitigate these?	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42729569	Annex 1	Site 59071I forgot to include in my original comments on this site the fact that it is Green Belt land. The NPPF states that green Belt land serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. This site fails EVERY SINGLE ONE of those purposes. It (a) would perpetuate the sprawl of Tonbridge; (b) would move Tonbridge towards Five Oak Green and TWBC's proposed new town at Tudeley; (c) remove the safeguarding of the countryside; (d) destroy the setting and special character of the historic hamlet at Postern Lane; and (e) would not assist in urban regeneration since it is neither derelict nor urban land.	Comment noted.
42590881	Annex 1	Site 59813 (Bush Road and North of Church Lane) Unsuitable for development. Very narrow lanes in area Poor accessibility Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. Sites are on greenbelt land. High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. Surface water discharge from 59813 in particular could flood property downstream. Building on 59813 goes against anti coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham. The CLH fuel pipeline goes through site 59813. No rail station close by or walkable. No parking at the nearest station. No lighting or pavement on road to station. The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery. The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.Apple-converted-space Sites 59639, 59640, 59753 (Bush Road) Unsuitable for development. Very narrow lanes in area Poor accessibility Sites are in flood zone 1. Bush Road and roads to the site flood. Bush road unlit with no pavements Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. Anti coalescence, the hamlet of Peckham Bush should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham. Animal sanctuary on Bush Road close to the development Sites are on greenbelt land. There is an ancient pilgrimage trail passing through The proposed new town on the A26 will cause further flooding to watercourse in the area No rail station close by or walkable. No parking at the nearest station No lighting or pavement on road to station. The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.Apple-converted-space Sites 59789, 59682 (Church Lane - South towards East Peckham) Unsuitable for development. Narrow lanes Poor accessibility, sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood. A main river, Coult Stream, runs through the site and floods Any surface water discharge from these sites will flood property downstream Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. High ground water means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. Sites are on greenbelt land. Building goes against anti-coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham. No rail station close by or walkable. No parking at the nearest station. No lighting or pavement on road to station. The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery. The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.Apple-converted-space Site 59782 (Hale Street towards Bush Road) Unsuitable for development. Narrow lanes Poor accessibility, sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood. A main river, Coult Stream, runs through the site and floods Any surface water discharge from these sites will flood property downstream Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. The CLH fuel pipeline goes through site. High ground water means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. Sites are on greenbelt land. Building goes against anti-coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham. Sites 59742 (North of Brookside) Garden Centre Unsuitable for development. Poor accessibility, sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood. Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. High ground water means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. Sites are on greenbelt land. No rail station close by or walkable. No parking at the nearest station. No lighting or pavement on road to station. The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery. The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.Apple-converted-space Sites 59747, 59806, 59846 (Peckham Bush to Hadlow & Mereworth) Sites include grade 1 and 2 agricultural land Unsuitable for development. Poor accessibility, sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood. Sites are green belt land Sites are in the catchment area for the count stream and Boroughs Oak stream both of which regularly flood East Peckham Surface water discharge from sites will increase flood risk in East Peckham Site 59806 completely overwhelms two important heritage assets (St Michael's church and Roydon Hall). If development happens for this site it should be East of the A228 to protect these assets. Views both of and from St Michael's church will be ruined An ancient pilgrimage	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>trail runs through these sites If 59806 is developed a strong boundary of green belt should be painted between it and Peckham Bush No rail station close by or walkable. No parking at the nearest station. No lighting or pavement on road to station. The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery. The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.Apple-converted-space Site 59646 (Hop Farm) Unsuitable for development. Site acts as a flood plain protection for East Peckham village The Medway river is along the entire northern border and development on this land could create serious flooding in East Peckham by displacing water back into the village The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site both major sources of flooding within the village Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstreamApple-converted-space Site is almost entirelyApple-converted-space within flood zone 3 Site is completely cut off from village services in times of flooding East Peckham flood wardens cannot reach this site in times of flooding without risking life Sites are green belt land High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. Anti coalescence policy, the hamlet of Belting must be kept separate from East Peckham No parking at the nearest station. No lighting or pavement on road to station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP surgery. The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.Apple-converted-space</p>	
42740033	Annex 1	<p>Site 59813Narrow lanes. Poor accessibility. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. All roads to the site flood. Site can be isolated from village services during times of flooding. High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Surface water discharge from this site could flood property downstream. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. The CLH fuel pipeline system runs through this site. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at the nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42740033	Annex 1	<p>xdj266r x11i5rnm xat24cr x1mh8g0r x1vvkbs x126k92a site 59646, Hop Farm land, massive site all along the Medway from Branbridges to past Oak Weir Lock. The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land. The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village. Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstream. The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3. Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding. During flooding there is significant risk of loss of life in this area. East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham. There is no parking at nearest station. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42740033	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59639, 59640 & 59753 (ALI Bush Rd East Peckham)East Peckham is a rural community that consists of nine Hamlets. Established anti-coalescence planning policy dictates that the distinct nature of the Hamlets must stay protected and preserved. The three main rivers of the Borough run through the village, flooding of roads, residential and business properties is a regular occurrence. The entirety of the village of East Peckham, including its constituent Hamlets, is surrounded by land designated as green belt. This is not a suitable site for development because: Site 59639 is green belt and also consists of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The Revised NPPF (2021) indicates at paragraph 137 that openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. The openness of the Green Belt has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect. 'Open' can mean the absence of development in spatial terms, and it follows that openness can be harmed even when development is not readily visible from the public realm.The Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) states the Hamlets of East Peckham must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. Developing site 59639 will contribute to adjoining Peckham Bush to East Peckham and therefore be in opposition to current anti-coalescence policy. Roads that access site 59639 are unlit, very narrow and have no pavements. To the north is</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Stanford Lane and Bullen Lane, both of which can flood. Bush Rd, from which the site is accessed, is also narrow and floods during heavy rainfall. To the South is Church Lane that regularly floods and is impassable during periods of heavy rain. Ground water tables are high in this area. A recent application for a major development on the nearby Church Lane (ref 21/03353/FL highlighted the unsuitability of SuDS as there is not enough clearance between maximum groundwater levels and the underside of soak ways. Site 59639 may need considerable ground build up (500mm) to achieve the minimum clearances as stated in the SuDS Manual. This will have the knock-on effect of displacing surface and flood water into existing properties. An animal sanctuary is within 100 metres of site 59639 and development would harm the nature and environment in which these animals reside. Site 59639 has an ancient pilgrimage trail running directly adjacent to it and is close by to many heritage assets. There is a proposed new town on the A26, sites 59806 and 59811, should these sites be developed the Bush Rd area will become at risk of serious flooding by the proposed new town directly uphill from site 59639. The nearest train station is 2.7km from the site, and is not a commuter station. The roads to it are narrow, without lighting or pavement and regularly flood making it impassable to pedestrian and vehicle. There is no parking at the station. No booking office. No telephone. No toilets. No wheelchair availability. No step free access. No accessible taxis. No impaired mobility set down and no staff. The 6000-8000 homes being built in the Capel and Paddock Wood developments are within 3 miles of East Peckham. This will cause flooding and traffic issues within East Peckham as well as place huge strain on infrastructure. This housing will meet need in the East Peckham area, and to build more locally will completely overwhelm the area in every way imaginable. Flooding, traffic and housing need calculations from the Capel and Paddock Wood developments to be taken into account whilst considering site 59639. Due to the reasons outlined above, East Peckham Parish Council does not consider that this site is suitable for development, and should not be included as part of the Local Plan. It would destroy green belt and increase flooding risk. The ground water levels are unsuitable for the use of SuDs. Anti-coalescence policy also dictates the site is unsuitable. The surrounding roads and lanes are very narrow, and regularly flood from numerous sources. East Peckham has lost important infrastructure in recent years, most notably the GP Surgery, pubs and the bakery. There is no accessible commuter railway station. East Peckham should no longer be classed as a Rural Service Centre. Should site 59639 be chosen for development, East Peckham Parish Council would expect sequential testing to evidence that there is no more suitable site for development elsewhere within the Borough. Site 59753 is green belt and also consists of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The Revised NPPF (2021) indicates at paragraph 137 that openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. The openness of the Green Belt has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect. 'Open' can mean the INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL CONSULTATION: 59753 Bush Road 42 Page absence of development in spatial terms, and it follows that openness can be harmed even when development is not readily visible from the public realm. The Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) states the Hamlets of East Peckham must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. Developing site 59753 will contribute to adjoining Peckham Bush to East Peckham and therefore be in opposition to current anti-coalescence policy. Roads that access site 59753 are unlit, very narrow and have no pavements. To the north is Stanford Lane and Bullen Lane, both of which can flood. Bush Rd, from which the site is accessed, is also narrow and floods during heavy rainfall. To the South is Church Lane that regularly floods and is impassable during periods of heavy rain. Ground water tables are high in this area. A recent application for a major development on the nearby Church Lane (ref 21/03353/FL highlighted the unsuitability of SuDS as there is not enough clearance between maximum groundwater levels and the underside of soak ways. Site 59753 may need considerable ground build up (500mm) to achieve the minimum clearances as stated in the SuDS Manual. This will have the knock-on effect of displacing surface and flood water into existing properties. An animal sanctuary is within 100 metres of site 59753 and development would harm the nature and environment in which these animals reside. Site 59753 has an ancient pilgrimage trail running directly adjacent to it and is close by to many heritage assets. There is a proposed new town on the A26, sites 59806 and 59811, should these sites be developed the Bush Rd area will become at risk of serious flooding by the proposed new town directly uphill from site 59753.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42744417	Annex 1	I am writing to express my total opposition to your plans to build on green infill areas around Leybourne including the 'bomb hole', the donkey field, the field alongside Castle Way where the children's play ground and the dog exercise area on Lillieburn. We have far too much development in our area and following your unilateral decision (clearly not taking any notice whatsoever of the many letters of opposition from all round the area) to build on the 40 acre field there is no green space from Maidstone through to Leybourne now! You take no responsibility for the implications of increased traffic movements this and subsequent developments will bring to the roads especially the A20. If you took just a few minutes away from your office at rush hour/school times you will see that it is plainly obvious that the existing infrastructure is insufficient now! Furthermore, whilst you insist on the developers providing doctors surgeries etc. these are left empty as recruitment is impossible in the South East, look at the recent example at Leybourne Chase. Surely the planning officer can not be that short sighted not to understand the dire situation relating to Kingshill surgery where appointments are non-existent and patient satisfaction is on the floor. To build even more housing on infill sites is short sighted at best and totally irresponsible at worst. I would like to think that my comments will be reviewed along with every other objection although I suspect that they will be binned along with everyone else who has expressed disapproval.	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.
42744929	Annex 1	I would like to object to the plans to build on site ref. 59884 adjacent to Tower View and Maypole Drive. This is a really nice space for families - one of the only Green spaces remaining. Children play games on the green and it is a really lovely environment for local families walking their dogs and playing games with their children. It is a beautiful outlook. The planting displays encourage bees and other insects to pollenate the plants. Additionally the Kings Hill medical practice is already full to capacity. It is already difficult to get an appointment! I urge you not to build here. It would be a great shame.	Comment noted.
42745313	Annex 1	Ref 59742 East Peckham I am very concerned regarding the proposal to build on this green belt land which is rich in wildlife and birds such as egrets. Additionally it floods as it is in flood zones 2 and 3. This causes flooded roads and properties downstream. Misery and distress for many residents, some of them elderly who have lived in the village for many years. In fact EP floods in several areas including the village centre as well as Hale Street and this will impact further. Why is this even being considered when green spaces are so essential to mental wellbeing and to our wildlife. We have no doctors surgery, no infrastructure to support all these proposed residents, we are a rural settlement being bombarded by planning applications. Look at brownfield sites and all the unoccupied properties for development across the south east and leave EPs green sites alone.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42744641	Annex 1	SITE IDS: 59813, 59639, 59640, 59753 and 59782 All the above sites are unsuitable for development due to i) very poor accessibility; ii) sites in flood zones 2 and 3; iii) roads to the sites flood; iv) sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding; v) high ground water means the use of soak aways is unlikely to be suitable/sustainable for this area; vi) sites on greenbelt land; vii) surface water discharge from 59813 in particular could flood property downstream; viii) building on site 59813 contradicts anti-coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham; ix) CLH fuel pipeline goes through 59813; x) no railway station close by; xi) closest railway station is not a mainline station, has no parking and has no direct routes to London; xii) closest railway station has no lighting or pavement on the roads leading to it and the roads flood; xiii) there is no GP surgery in the village (the NHS refused to continue funding it so it closed down) Yalding or Paddock Wood are the closest GP surgeries. The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a Rural Service Centre to a Rural Settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42590337	Annex 1	Site 59646 Hop Farm, East Peckham On the west side of this site is old quarry workings. ? Quick sand? Not able to build on this? More importantly it is an area where lots of Nightingales congregate each spring to gather, sing and breed. These birds are under threat and their habitats are ever decreasing. Housing nearby, even if the area they use is left will put them under threat due to the proximity of people, pets- cats and dogs. They nest near the ground so are especially vulnerable.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42192289	Annex 1	Duplicate comment	Comment noted.
42590337	Annex 1	Site 59876 Strettit Farm This site is on the opposite side of the road to sites 59837 and 59613. Same issues potentially apply. Bad, restricted view access near a bend on a narrow road. This site is also higher than the road and holds back water when there is flooding or high water. If the field was used for building on- acknowledging there are already	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		farm/other buildings in existence then this water at present held back would cause flooding and damage to more properties in the village and down into the village centre.	
42192289	Annex 1	Duplicate comment	Comment noted.
42192289	Annex 1	Duplicate comment	Comment noted.
42192289	Annex 1	Duplicate comment	Comment noted.
42192289	Annex 1	Duplicate comment	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	ID59447 this is a car park which is critical to the local people and businesses of the village. Parking is under severe pressure at present	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	map ID 59488 this is a car park which is critical to the local people and businesses of the village. Parking is under severe pressure at present	Comment noted.
42746337	Annex 1	Site 59449After reading all objectives I disagree with building on this site, my children live in this area and it is the only safe green area to play on the other is down by new road which is a busy dangerous road, on your map it is not clear but on satellite mode in Google maps it shows this green is the only one in the area. Kids need outside space and playing on concrete and in the road isn't safe or fun.	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	map ID 59602this area is of outstanding beauty and would effect views of St Leonard's Tower. It is far from local shops and services meaning people would need to drive everywhere	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	map 59619This is an area of outstanding beauty and pristine wildlife area on greenbelt land. This area is adjacent to Maceys Meadow which is owned by the parish and serves as an ecological and wildlife area. Building houses next to Maceys meadow would be a detrimental act against the community and expand the limits of the village into green belt - also this is more than typical walking distance people are willing to make to get to the shops. Really poor accessibility	Comment noted.
42617505	Annex 1	Site ID 59740Well you cannot be serious!This would decimate this entire area and add to the misery of residents living with the dreadful Ditton Edge Disaster.For so many reasons. Including.1. A beautiful area that you will ruin.2. Enjoyed by countless cyclists and walkers.3. Will remove a very large area of grade A agricultural land.4. Will remove a very large area of green space that separates West and East Malling from Kings Hill.5. It has a roads infrastructure worse than what is about to descend on us all from Ditton Edge.....I could go on and on here....this site cannot in all honesty be being considered as a development site can it?And finally---have you noticed that you are putting virtually ALL development in the north of the borough?	Comment noted.
42740897	Annex 1	Site ID 13098644 The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: 59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809 I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A). The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. The importance of domestic food production has been highlighted by the recent food shortages cause by the war in Ukraine. Local food production is made more important by the effects of climate change. They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. Dealing with each site in turn:	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42469729	Annex 1	Site 59742 Behind Brookside is not a suitable site for the following reasons Green belt land. Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.Site is isolated from village and it's services during times of flooding.High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.A stream (I think called Boroughs Oak Stream) runs directly through this land and regularly floods roads and properties downstream on Hale St and beyond. Any surface water discharge into this stream will increase likelihood of flooding.Should the new settlement on the A26 be built this stream will likely flood significantly more often. Egrets can be spotted here. There is no rail station close by.There is no parking at nearest station.There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.The roads to the station flood.The village has no GP Surgery.The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42752577	Annex 1	Site 59623 on the corner of Yardley Park Road and Shipbourne road is completely unsuitable for development. It has been rejected by the planning process already on the basis of its inappropriateness. This is not only due to the fact that it is placed in a conservation area as well as breaching covenants that exist on the road, but more importantly owing to the significant, impractical and dangerous impact the proposed access for the proposed development would have. The roundabout directly next to which the site is located is already extremely busy and the shipbourne road to the south of the roundabout (from which access would be required) is a significant bottle neck owing to its narrow width and the already busy traffic. In addition the one stop convenience store (which is a valued and much used shop in the area) is directly adjacent to the site and the lorries that supply the store need to park on the street directly where the new proposed access would be, which just will not work and make the traffic even worse. Most significant is that there are a number of schools in the immediate area with many children going to and from school at the beginning and end of the school day which adds to the already congested area, this development will make that even worse. In short, the proposed development is neither in keeping with the area nor will it alleviate in a significant way the housing needs of TMBC, but it will very materially have a detrimental impact on the accesbility of Tonbridge and add to what is already a significant traffic problem.	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.
42626337	Annex 1	Site ID 59613As a resident of East Peckham for 25 years we would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development.There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building. The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham.This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations.This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route.The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42626369	Annex 1	As a resident of East Peckham for 25 years we would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development. There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building. The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham. This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations. This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route. The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.	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.
42717185	Annex 1	As a resident of East Peckham for 25 years we would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development. There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building. The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham. This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations. This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route. The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42720097	Annex 1	<p>Site 59424 Residential 164 dwellings woods end of Clearheart LaneThis development is rear of Redwell Grove, Bancroft Lane, Hollandbury Park, Cellini Walk,Alderwick Grove, Quindell Place, Clearheart Lane, McArthur Drive, Victory Drive.Reasons for objections - DEFRA Forest Inventory, Ancient Woodland and TO protected trees,over development with inadequate resources on Kings Hill, harm to protected species, outside of,This development surrounds Tower View, Melrose Avenue Braeburn Way, Alfriston Grove,Bovarde AvenueReasons for objections - change of character of the area, traffic impact to and from Kings Hillcentre, loss of public open space.] Site 59534 Residential 18 dwellings Tower View Green North WestThis development surrounds Tower View, Woodford Grove, Cardinal Walk, Baxter Way,Hazen Road, Kendall AvenueReasons for objections - Change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre,loss of public space.[X] Site 59544 Conservation Area off Bancroft Lane Residential 5 dwellingsThis development adjoins Bancroft Lane, Cellini Walk and rear of Redwell GroveReasons for objections - Harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservationareas, harm to non-listed Heritage assets, preservation order.L)Xi Site 59547 Residential 6 dwellings Discovery Drive Next to Conservation AreaThis development adjoins Discovery Drive, Rougemont and Avion GardensReasons for objections - loss of open Green space, harm to conservation areas and harm tosignificant of conservation areas.1X1 59630 Fields North of Amber Lane mixed use 157 dwellingsThis development is rear of Shoesmith Lane, Amber Lane, Sandow PlaceReasons for objections - Proposed Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams,outside of the confines of existing developments, traffic restricted on local roads, visual impactfrom Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Ancient Woodland[X] Site 59631 Wateringbury Road Heath Farm next to Sports Park 136 dwellingsReasons for objections - Existing pubic Open Space for Kings Hill\ Countryside, harm to quiet laneand rural road networks, outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agriculturalland, traffic restricted on local roads.[X1 Site 59634 Hoath Wood Ancient Woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposalResidential 104 dwellings Adjoins Lavender Road, Rear of Glenton Avenue, Keepsake Drive,Reasons for objections-han. vonse/vation area and harm to Sighiicance or coldervationareas, Ancient woodland and Tree Preservation Orders, countryside, harm to quiet lane and ruralroad networks, outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agricultural land, trafficrestricted on local roads, visual impact from AONB.[X1 Site 59655 Road to North Pole behind Victory Drive Residential 143 dwellingsReasons for objections - Green belt, Countryside, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks,outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted onlocal roads.1 Site 59740 Broadwater Farm mixed use estimate 3000 dwellingsReasons for objections - Harm to conservation areas and harm to significant of conservationareas, proposed Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams, harm to non-listedheritage assets, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of existingdevelopments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted on local roads, inadequate resources -KCC indicated suggested school location not economic, no retail centre.Severe Impact onbio-diversilySurrounds Mitchell Road, Kate Reed Wood, Lapins Lane, Russet Way, Lambourne Drive,Meteor Road A228Reasons for objections - Ancient woodland (part of site), Green Belt, countryside, access issuesto local roads.****59752/59762 South of Lapins Lane (Phase 1) to A26 - details awaited site 59797 West Quarter of Kings Hill Golf Course to A26 Residential 1228 dwellingsReasons for objections - Harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservationareas, Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams, harm to quiet lane and rural roadGreen Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams, harm to quiet lane and rural roadnetworks, outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agricultural land, trafficrestricted on local roads.X1 site 59802 Residential 644 dwellings East f Canon Lane South of Hollandbury ParkReasons for objections - Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines ofexisting developments./ifs* o Lagniquistrateg; traticc onstasted on local roads, and severe inpastcapariM[X1 Site 59884 Tower Green area (North East) Residential 21 dwellingsReasons for objections - Change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre,loss of public open space]*] I object to Kings Hill being classified as an urban settlement (Q.2 Local plan question) asit does not have the facilities to support its status - it does not have the facilities that would berequired to support the additional population that would be added as a result of its classification.over soom to the train stahon therefere car have would increase,[X] 1 support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and WestMalling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42757153	Annex 1	59750Mereworth's built environment is almost entirely to the north of The Street. This green field site is to the south and borders the historic listed church. Development here would entirely change the nature of the village.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42757153	Annex 1	59599Seven Mile Lane is already a notorious death trap, even though it hasn't yet managed to claim the 3 lives you seek. Further development on this road would no doubt accelerate the achievement of that milestone.	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	59752The A228 at this point is already a notorious death trap, even though it hasn't yet managed to claim the 3 lives you seek. Further development on this road would no doubt accelerate the achievement of that milestone.	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	59816The Street has already been spoiled by back-filling in Torrington Close and Church Close. To do similarly here, adjacent to the primary school, would compound the traffic congestion that blights the village twice a day.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42757153	Annex 1	59598Seven Mile Lane is already a notorious death trap, even though it hasn't yet managed to claim the 3 lives you seek. Further development on this road would no doubt accelerate the achievement of that milestone.	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	59760At Kent Street the A228 is exceptionally narrow for a major north-south artery and has been the subject of multiple proposals over the years to make it safer. To put further housing here would exacerbate an already intractable problem.	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	59759At Kent Street the A228 is exceptionally narrow for a major north-south artery and has been the subject of multiple proposals over the years to make it safer. Beech Road is a single-track lane that is used as a rat run between Seven Mile Lane and the A228, making it unsafe to walk along. To put further housing here would exacerbate an already intractable problem.	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	59758Beech Road is a single-track lane that is used as a rat run between Seven Mile Lane and the A228, making it unsafe to walk along. To put further housing here would exacerbate an already intractable problem.	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	59757Beech Road is a single-track lane that is used as a rat run between Seven Mile Lane and the A228, making it unsafe to walk along. New Pound Lane is similar and could not accommodate the additional traffic that development of this site would generate.	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	59761At Kent Street the A228 is exceptionally narrow for a major north-south artery and has been the subject of multiple proposals over the years to make it safer. To put further housing here would exacerbate an already intractable problem.	Comment noted.
42753249	Annex 1	As a resident of East Peckham for most of my life we would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development. There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building. The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham. This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations. This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route. The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42717025	Annex 1	As a resident of East Peckham and the borough of Tonbridge and Malling I would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development. There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building. The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham. This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations. This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route. The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.	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.
42771393	Annex 1	My comments relate to sites 59682, 59782 and 59813.the hamlet of Hale Street has no doctors, no shopping facilities, no dentist, and no isupporting nfastructure.. currently with the recent closure of the local doctors the closest doctors is at Paddock Wood. The drs at Paddock wood already can't cope with the increased dwellings being built there and as such the next appointment can be as much as 28 says away.The sites proposed all sit higher than the existing surrounding properties in the area which are already in a flood zone.Each site sits alongside very narrow lane with poor accessibility, the already have parking problems and all road in the area already have flooding problems.These sites are isolated from the village when the roads flood.These sites are all valuable green belt with rare natural species, egrets, buzzards, and newts where the land runs alongside the streams.If the sites were to be deemed suitable then surface water discharge from these sites will cause significant flooding downstream .High ground water and the use of soakaways will be unsuitable in this area so the water must be directly discharged somewhere which will end up putting additional pressure on already stretched rivers/streams.Building oil these sites will also go directly against the TMBC established Coalescence statement where it is noted that hamlet of Hale Street must remain separate from East Peckham. building on these sites will be in-filing between East Peckham and Hale StreetThere are no direct services in Hale Street , so should be downgraded to Rural area from a rural settlement. (East Peckham Village should be Downgraded from a Rural Service Centre to a rural settlementSites 59782 ans 59813 with have a large gas pipe under the hedge so development will be hazardousSite 59813 sits alongside Holy trinity church. this historic church current sits in rural surroundings and should be kept as such.	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.
42747073	Annex 1	I wish to comment on site 59811 [Page 696]. This is a huge area of green belt land and long established productive dairy and arable farm land. It is totally unsuitable for housing development - the rural road infrastructure cannot cope with existing traffic, there are serious issue of water drainage and management and this area is used as a significant rural recreation space for Hadlow residents many of whom use the public footpath which goes up to Oxenhoath. It is also at some considerable distance from shops, the health centre and schools. There is no bus route so there would be a huge increase in motor traffic just to get into Hadlow over small rural roads. And surely green belt is there for a purpose: to protect the countryside. This site is completely outside the village envelope for possible permitted development. I also note it is not included on 'Urban Capacity Study' by Urban Intelligence nor on the MBC SLA Final Assessments Document for Hadlow: the reason for this discrepancy it totally unclear. But Site 59811 seems to fail on all these criteria of assessment for suitability for development. I would also add that the map in Annex 1 is of very poor quality and appears to contain a number of errors.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. Uncertain what the MBC SLA Final Assessments Document is.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42771649	Annex 1	Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat within this site is home to rare crested newts, which are protected by law as they are an endangered species. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted due to the Renovo Care home. The current single-track access road is unpaved and unlit and entirely unsuitable to further traffic congestion.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42773409	Annex 1	Site 59811A large proportion of this site is classified as Grade II* listed Park and Garden. This is highlighted in List Entry No 1001355 of the Historic England List. Within the Parkland there are many ancient and veteran trees that must have Tree Protection Orders on them. If not, then they certainly should have. This historic site is formed mainly from the land that was owned and managed by the Oxen Hoath Estate for hundreds of years. It now acts as grazing land for cattle for a large local farm and is home to a diverse range of rare British wildlife including Buzzards, Kestrels, Owls, Deer and Stoats. Furthermore, the road networks on all sides of this site are narrow country roads with limited if any opportunity for widening. As such it's clear that this site should be rejected.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42436577	Annex 1	Site number 59492. This is a well used car park in a local service centre where there is a shortage of parking available. Should it be developed, what alternative parking would be provided? I assume that the site is in Council ownership, so should be retained to provide parking within Borough Green Village.	Comment noted.
42765409	Annex 1	ID number 59613This land is partially owned by [REDACTED] and ideally located for housing development in the middle of the village of East Peckham. The interested developers are aware that there has to be an area of open land separating Snoll Hatch from East Peckham. Our land is of low flood risk, we have been here nearly 40 years and at no time has our land flooded. The design would ideally be mainly starter homes to enable the younger community to buy homes in their own village, something that is not possible at the moment. This would enable our school to continue as without these smaller starter homes, we are in danger of becoming a retirement village with no future.	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	site 59493: This is the car park for a well used railway station. The car park can be full on occasions so there is little scope to develop even part of the site. While it would be possible to create a multi-storey car park, this would not be in keeping with a village location.	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59829: This site is a small area of woodland which does not have direct access to a public road. It appears to be part of the land known as Borough Green Sand Pits and it is not clear whether it is in the same ownership. It would require another means of access to be brought into use, this would most likely be via the sand pits and so it should be discounted as a developable site until access can be provided.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59632: This site was considered by the planning inspectorate as part of an appeal linked to the new school and new Memorial Hall, both of which have now been constructed. The decision of the inspectorate was that there was no justification for removing this site from the MGB and that housing could not be permitted on this site.	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	site number: 59620This is an area of outstanding beauty and pristine wildlife area on greenbelt land. This area is adjacent to Maceys Meadow which is owned by the parish and serves as an ecological and wildlife area. Building houses next to Maceys meadow would be a detrimental act against the community and environment expanding the limits of the village into green belt - also this is more than typical walking distance people are willing to make to get to the shops. Really poor accessibility/ road and rail/ no public transport	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site number 59621This is an area of outstanding beauty and pristine wildlife area on greenbelt land. This area is adjacent to Maceys Meadow which is owned by the parish and serves as an ecological and wildlife area. Building houses next to Maceys meadow would be a detrimental act against the community and environment expanding the limits of the village into green belt - also this is more than typical walking distance people are willing to make to get to the shops. Really poor accessibility/ road and rail/ no public transport	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site number: 59622This is an area of outstanding beauty and pristine wildlife area on greenbelt land. This area is adjacent to Maceys Meadow which is owned by the parish and serves as an ecological and wildlife area. Building houses next to Maceys meadow would be a detrimental act against the community and environment expanding the limits of the village into green belt - also this is more than typical walking distance people are willing to make to get to the shops. Really poor accessibility/ road and rail/ no public transport	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59489: This site is a small green space surrounded by housing. Crow Hill is already too narrow for large vehicles to access the houses and the site is overlooked by the surrounding houses, so any house built on this site would have no	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		privacy. The public green space is important to all the residents of Crow Hill and I consider that it is unsuitable for any type of development.	
42746017	Annex 1	site number 59645The site at Manor Farm is in an area of outstanding beauty and is near/close proximity to St Leonard's Tower. The oldest part of West Malling.Creating 42 new houses in such close proximity to a site of such historic interest would be of severe detriment to the local community and environment.This is prime agricultural land which would be a lossPublic transport links - nearby bus stop has an uncertain future. Local school at cricket meadow is running at capacity - there would be no room to accommodate new families to the area with existing infrastructure	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.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59822: This site is sandwiched between the J Clubb sand pit and the Platt Industrial Estate, with access possible from either side. It is not clear who owns this land and whether it has already been given permission for mineral extraction. I understand that Kent CC will oppose any planning applications that diminish access to minerals and this might be an issue on this site.	Comment noted.
42765409	Annex 1	ID. Number 59837This land is owned by [REDACTED] and is ideal as a smaller development if the alternative site - ID.59613, which includes this land is considered too large. It is ideally placed in the centre of East Peckham, is not high flood risk and importantly, could be developed without joining East Peckham to Snoll Hatch.	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59717: this is known as the Glebe Lands and is opposite the site of the old Platt Primary School which has now been demolished. The site has a steep bank up from road level, which makes access to the site difficult and on the north side lies a railway line. Because of the dip in the A25 road on the approach to the site from the west, any site access could be hazardous as it is very difficult to see traffic beyond the brow.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59737: it is not clear why only the area closest to the road has been offered for development as Ingleborough Farm extends much further up the hill. As for the Glebe Lands site further to the west, sight lines on the A25 make exiting the site difficult, although the lane has been used for many years to access the farm.	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59724: This site is most peculiar as it is a very steep bank rising from a steep and narrow lane. The site looks too narrow to fit any construction onto it and there can be no space to park a car on the road as it is effectively single track along that length of the lane. I cannot see any realistic site of providing any accommodation other than a rabbit warren with direct access off the road.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59843: This site can only be accessed from Crouch Lane which is narrow and unlit. The flow of traffic up and down the lane has increased significantly over the years and there has been a noticeable increase in traffic when the A25 is congested with cars and vans cutting the corner from the A2016 Seven Mile Lane.The shape of the south end of the site implies that there may be scope to add a house between Oakview and The Little Spinney. There is also a gate giving access to this site from the spur leading to these two houses, but this access would add to congestion on one of the narrower lengths of the lane. The existing development at Tillmans could provide access to this site from the foot of the lane, but there is a shortage of parking spaces which make this development permanently congested with parked cars. If it were linked to site 59748, there would be potential for access through that other site, but then a risk of ratruns being used would arise when the A 25 is busy. The sewer through Borough Green and Platt is in very poor condition and close to capacity so any development of these sites may well required a new sewer to accept the outfall from this side of Borough Green. The electrical infrastructure would also need improvement as a pole mounted transformer serves the houses on Crouch Lane as far as Pine Hall.Should this site be developed it will overlook the Recreation Ground in Maidstone Road. Any permission should require the retention of the tree screen so that the greenness of the recreation ground is retained.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42096289	Annex 1	59742This site is green belt land and currently has no access by road. It's is also flood zone 2 and 3.The Boroughs Oak Stream runs directly through the site and regularly floods properties and roads downstream on Hale St and beyond. This stream also floods sites 59855 and 59650.As a flood warden I must object to development of site 59742 due to these flooding issues.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42096289	Annex 1	59855 This site is in areas of medium and high flood risk. Surface water discharge floods nearby properties and the Boriughs Oaks Steam runs directly adjacent to the site. This stream regularly bursts its banks and floods surrounding properties and roads. Sites 59742 and 59806 also have Boroughs Oak Stream running through them and development of them will increase flooding on site 59855.As a flood warden I object to this site being developed due to these longstanding flooding issues.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42096289	Annex 1	59650This site is in areas of medium and high flood risk. Surface water discharge floods nearby properties and the Boriughs Oaks Steam runs directly adjacent to the site. This stream regularly bursts its banks and floods surrounding properties and roads. Sites 59742 and 59806 also have Boroughs Oak Stream running through them and development of them will increase flooding on site 59855. As a flood warden I object to this site being developed due to these longstanding flooding issues.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42096289	Annex 1	59806This site has the Boroughs Oak Stream running through it as well as being the catchment area for the main river, the Coult Stream. Both these watercourses regularly flood properties and roads within East Peckham and development of site 59806 will significantly increase that flooding. Both these watercourse run through and flood many potential sites in the parish of Eadt Peckham. As flood warden I object to development of site 59806 and should it be developed the increased flood rush must be taken into account when considering other sites within East Peckham. Our flooding issues are severe. Over 800 of 1400 properties are at flood risk, by far the highest ratio in the borough. Major development a mile upstream from the village of East Peckham will create far worse flooding.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42096289	Annex 1	59789 This site is green belt land. It has the Coult Stream, one of the three main rivers of the Borough, running directly through it. The site is located on flood zones 2 and 3 with extremely high ground water levels that make the use of SuDS unsuitable as minimum clearances stated in the SuDS manual cannot be achieved. The Coult Stream is a major source of flooding within the village and floods many roads and properties. Any surface water discharge into it will significantly increase flooding. As a flood warden I strongly object to this site being developed.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42096289	Annex 1	59525This site should not be developed. It is a very important and well used asset to the community and is known as Westwood Green. To develop this site will be a tremendous loss to the community. On top of its social and recreational uses it is also a meeting point during times of emergency.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25349153	Annex 1	<p>Comments on sites proposed in East Malling The Reg 18 Local Plan states :- 1.1.1. A Local Plan should be prepared in accordance with national planning policy within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). 1. Countryside and ‘confines of the built up area’ Sites outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC ‘s Proposals Map) and are designated as ‘countryside’. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that ‘planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’. 2. Heritage assets Para 200 of the NPPF states :- “Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional”. According to britishlistedbuildings.co.uk, there are 65 listed buildings in the parish of East Malling, including 4 Grade 1 (Clare House, Bradbourne House, its stable block and barns, and the Church of St. James). Any developments which would adversely affect the setting of these listed buildings should be rejected. 3. Conservation Area There are several Conservation Areas around East Malling - New Barns and Broadwater Farm, Clare House Park, Mill Street, East Malling and Bradbourne House. TMBC seeks to ensure that existing built environments of an historic or high quality will be preserved or enhanced and to conserve and protect the historic environment, including Conservation Areas. 4. Loss of prime agricultural land The DEFRA website shows that the sites surrounding the built up area of East Malling have very good soil classification, with an area which includes the Broadwater Farm site having excellent. Para 174 (b) of the NPPF states : “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland”. Footnote 58 states “Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality”. We understand that soils of this quality are relatively rare in Kent, emphasising their importance in the Malling area. 5. Quiet Lanes The Quiet Lanes network was registered under the Transport Act of 2000, which recognises the need to prioritise recreational use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders in these peaceful country lanes. This is a statutory designation in 2001 under the Transport Act 2000 and therefore a material consideration. It recognises the need to prioritise this area for recreation by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, over motorists. Water Lane and Lavenders Road, part of Broadwater Road, Stickens Lane, Well Street, Pikey Lane, The Heath and Sweets Lane are in the Quiet Lanes network. This Quiet Lane network must be protected. I comment on individual East Malling sites below: 59448. Bradbourne Park Road This site is adjacent to the Bradbourne Conservation Area, whose setting would be adversely affected by a housing development on the site. This site should be rejected. 59631 Watringbury Road The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC ‘s Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as ‘countryside’. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that ‘planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. Access to this site from the north would be through East Malling village. Chapel Street and the High Street are effectively single track roads because of parked cars, which interrupt the flow of traffic and create blind spots. Any increase in traffic will exacerbate this. The site has a soil classification of ‘very good’. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states “Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality”. This site should be rejected. 59636. Stickens Lane The site is adjacent to the Mill Street Conservation Area. The development will result in harm to the setting and views into the Mill Street Conservation Area. The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC ‘s Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as ‘countryside’. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that ‘planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also extend the built up area of East Malling westwards and erode the gap between East Malling and West Malling. The site has a</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". The Quiet Lane network, which includes the very narrow rural Stickens Lane and Pikey Lane, would be adversely affected by traffic emanating from the site. This site must be rejected. 59698. Clare Lane The site is opposite Clare House, a Grade I listed building and opposite the Clare House Park Conservation Area. In TMBC's proposals map, Clare House Park is designated as SQ3 (b) Historic Parks and Gardens. The setting of Clare House and the Conservation Area will be adversely affected by a housing development on this site. The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap between West Malling and East Malling. The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". There is a narrowing of Clare Lane by the bend in the road between Broadwater Road and Clarewood Drive, which gives rise to a blind spot when driving between the two. Any extra traffic caused by this development would increase the safety hazard. This site must be rejected. 59715. Ivy Farm The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside. Access to this site from the north would be through East Malling village. Chapel Street and the High Street are effectively single track roads because of parked cars, which interrupt the flow of traffic and create blind spots. Any increase in traffic will exacerbate this. The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". This site should be rejected. 59726. Wateringbury Road The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside. Access to this site from the north would be through East Malling village. Chapel Street and the High Street are effectively single track roads because of parked cars, which interrupt the flow of traffic and create blind spots. Any increase in traffic will exacerbate this. The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". This site should be rejected. 59740. Broadwater Farm - 112.75 hectares - mixed use This site is identical to that of the yet to be determined 2021 planning application (21/02719), except for the omission of the area of land to the west of the bypass which was to be an open space. The site is outside the confines of West Malling and Kings Hill and is therefore designated as countryside. NPPF Para 174 applies 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. The site impacts on both the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation Area and the Mill Street Conservation Area. The Kings Hill development was originally agreed to remain within the confines of the former airfield. The extent of the proposed site would cause unacceptable coalescence of Kings Hill with the urban areas of West Malling and East Malling. The quantum of houses that could be accommodated on the site would cause severe congestion in the local road network, and in particular to the Quiet Lanes in the area. The site is in an area of high grade agricultural land - some being Grade I and the rest Grade II. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". The existing planning application is for 900 houses. KCC therefore require two vehicular accesses. It is vital that neither creates harm to the Conservation Areas of New Barns</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>and Broadwater Farm and Mill Street and that the accesses are directly to the existing Kings Hill urban area. Other concerns are the harms to the aquifer for streams into East Malling and to non-listed heritage assets. This site must be firmly rejected. 59743. Winterfield Lane The site is adjacent to the southern end of the Forty Acres development, where permission was granted on Appeal for 250 houses. It is opposite the Clare House Park Conservation Area. The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap between West Malling and East Malling. The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". There is a narrowing of Clare Lane by the bend in the road between Broadwater Road and Clarewood Drive, which gives rise to a blind spot when driving between the two. Any extra traffic caused by this development would increase the safety hazard. This site must be rejected. 59756 London Road (adjacent to Forty Acres) The site is in East Malling, not Leybourne. The site is adjacent to that recently approved for the development of 250 houses. The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent a further encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap even more between Leybourne and East Malling. The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". The strip on the northern side of London Road, opposite the site, is designated in TMBC's proposals map as OS1 (el) as an Open Space to be Protected. Development of the site would adversely affect the setting of this Protected area. This site must be rejected. 59824. Clare Lane The site is adjacent to Clare House, which TMBC 's proposals map designates as SQ3 (b) Historic Parks and Gardens. Part of the site is opposite Clare House Park Conservation Area. The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap between East Malling and Leybourne and West Malling. The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". This site must be rejected. 59844. London Road Although this site is in Leybourne parish, it is adjacent to site 59756 and I comment below : The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap between East Malling and Leybourne and West Malling. The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality". The strip on the northern side of London Road, opposite the site, is designated in TMBC's proposals map as as OS1 (el) as an Open Space to be Protected. Development of the site would adversely affect the setting of this Protected area. This site must be rejected.</p>	
42783201	Annex 1	<p>ID 59842 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, requires significant greenfield land, will negatively impact a green infrastructure asset as well as biodiversity and geodiversity. This proposal will also negatively impact a heritage site. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist,</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic - especially given it is proposed in a location that currently only has a 'Fair' accessibility rating - this development would worsen that.	
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59635 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, requires significant greenfield land, Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59637 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, requires significant greenfield land, the loss of designated open spaces, Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic. Accessibility already poor.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59638 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, requires significant greenfield land, the loss of designated open spaces, and negatively impacts a green infrastructure asset, Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59647 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, requires significant greenfield and agricultural land land, negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59686 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59766 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, a green infrastructure asset and will and will have negative biodiversity impact and will result in the loss of designated open spaces. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic. Accessibility is already poor and the pressure from this proposed development would worsen that.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59610 Park Road Addington - The Parish Council would have no objection to the development of this site	Comment noted.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59628 Millhouse Lane Addington - The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site as we feel it would represent overdevelopment	Comment noted.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59725 Ford Lane - The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site. Although we would be concerned about the loss of this site as a leisure facility and the tourism it brings to the area we feel it would be a good site for affordable homes given its proximity to the road network and bus services	Comment noted.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59730 Addington Lane - The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We have concerns about more vehicles accessing the road which regularly floods in this area	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59736 - Addington Lane, Trottiscliffe - The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We have concerns about more vehicles accessing the road which regularly floods in this area	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59850 - East of Addington Village - The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We feel that any further development would destroy the openness of the area	Comment noted.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59812 Clearways, Addington - The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site and feel it would work well as a mixed-use site	Comment noted.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59830 - Borough Green Garden City - The Parish Council is concerned about the fact that Borough Green will lose its identity and be swamped by this development. We are concerned about the effect on the infrastructure and the impact this will have on our village. The proposal would undoubtedly result in an unwelcome increase in traffic and pollution in Trottiscliffe which is already used as a rat-run. We recognise that this site could provide some housing but feel it should be on a smaller scale.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42192289	Annex 1	When adding my initial comments, I exceeded the data levels allowed. After several attempts to load my comments, they went through in total on Comment ID /142. I have deleted all the other versions.	Comment noted.
42793665	Annex 1	<p>Ref Site 59806As a local resident in Stanford Lane I am lodging a strong objection to any development of site 59806 on the following grounds:The local A roads (A26 and A228) which border this proposed site are already extremely congested at peak times. This leads to the local, very narrow rural lanes being used as rat runs. In particular Stanford Lane and Martins Lane are used as cut-throughs, particularly when the A26 or the A228 are blocked or congested. My daughter is a wheelchair user who is frequently forced into the verge by traffic travelling too fast. Any development in this area (and particularly of the potential scale proposed) would inevitably increase this traffic use and consequently the likelihood of more road traffic incidents. Local farm traffic already uses the lanes on a frequent and regular basis, often late into the evenings during harvest time and this can also cause conflict between the tractors and ordinary road users. The state of the tarmac at the sides of the local lanes is already poor, with significant large potholes which are dangerous for both vehicles having to pull over to allow another to pass and for pedestrians. There are no pavements provided. Greater traffic flows as a result of any development would only make this worse.Your own assessment records as a significant negative that this site is placed within the poor accessibility band.The whole area, and the roads and lanes in question, are frequently prone to flooding and the proposed site falls into flood zones. Our property, and our neighbouring properties, sit at the bottom of the long and large incline up towards St Michael's Church across the A228. If any of this area were to be developed then it would inevitably result in the further displacement of rainfall, with the subsequent precipitation being diverted down the hill to our properties. There is already inadequate drainage for existing flows of rainwater, resulting in large areas of the surrounding roads frequently being flooded; to add to this existing problem would simply be bad planning and would create more serious problems. Additional surface water discharge down the hill towards our properties will increase the existing flood risk. The fact that the location of the site is in Flood zone 3 is noted in your own assessment and should in and of itself be a reason to remove the site from the local plan. There are also water courses within the site area.The site currently sits within the green belt, includes both Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural land and is an outstandingly beautiful area, with the current views up to and including the ancient St Michael's Church forming a beautiful backdrop to the rural village of East Peckham. Any development on this site would ruin that view, both towards and from St Michael's Church. Any development on this site would adversely impinge upon two important local heritage assets, and interrupt an ancient pilgrimage trail.Your own assessment identifies that the site is within 250m of one or more internationally or nationally designated geodiversity sites and contains an existing green infrastructure asset. I dispute the view that any major development in the proximity could potentially enhance such an asset. As stated in your own assessment, the site is in greenfield land and as such this should not be built upon or developed. This precious resource should be preserved for all to enjoy in the future. Your assessment asserts the fact that the potential development could provide more than 100 dwellings as a positive. However, it is a misguided illusion to believe that simply dropping such a development into this area in order to sufficiently meet new housing quotas will be a sustainable or viable solution. And once done, an existing rural community will have been ruined forever.The site is currently used primarily for soft fruit production and this appears to be a thriving business, with new areas being turned over to further production in just the last two years.There is no local infrastructure to support new housing development on this site.The local power supply is by overhead lines and is subject to frequent interruption.There is no mains gas supply to the area.There is no mains sewage, with local properties reliant upon private sewage treatment plants. Recent work to install a new plant at our property highlighted that the clay soil does not allow for adequate drainage, meaning that we had to install a bunded soakaway. There is no rail station within 3 miles and roads to the nearest two stations flood. There is no parking at Beltring station.The Parish of East Peckham has no GP Surgery. Hadlow GP Surgery is already overwhelmed and only staffed by part-time GPs.Local ambulance response times are already below standard.Local bus services have been reduced or cut.The local school provision is already inadequate and over-subscribed. There is no guarantee that any new residential development would stimulate the supply of additional educational capacityEast Peckham, whilst being a vibrant rural community, does not have the resources to be graded as a rural service centre and should be redefined as a rural settlement.Please take account of all the above reasons and remove this potential site from the Local Plan to ensure that there will not be any future proposal to develop housing on this site.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42800737	Annex 1	I refer to the following site numbers:59605, 59635, 59637, 59638, 59647, 59686, 59776, 59842, 59853, 59857, 59601,59811, 59859 and 59410All of these potential sites are either in or around the village of Hadlow and my comments therefore refer to all of them. My view is that further development of Hadlow is inappropriate for a number of reasons:- whilst it might appear that certain sites could be accessed from the Maidstone Road (eg sites 59638, 59686, 59647 and 59637) the reality is that the development of such sites will just increase the pressure on roads that are already over-congested. The village already suffers from having the busy Maidstone Road running through it - further traffic should not be encouraged by developing Hadlow further.- much of the land around Hadlow is green belt land. I am firmly of the opinion that this should not be developed. To do so would change the character of the village which currently benefits very much from the open spaces on its edges, for recreation and for the mental health of the residents. In addition, there is the need to protect wildlife and encourage biodiversity. Green belt land has been designated as such for a reason and that reason continues to exist. This land is of great value to the Hadlow community. The fact that any proposed land is green belt land should be a significant negative to development. - the current infrastructure of Hadlow would not be able to accommodate any further development. The school is a single form entry typical village school. It is suited to the current size of the village. The doctor's surgery is already at capacity. Any suggestion of providing an additional school or doctor's surgery would only compound the problem of needing to develop further land in order to do so. My arguments above apply equally to this point. The population of the village is already high in relation to its facilities and the village can't support any further population increase. - many of the sites identified (especially 59638, 59686, 59647 and 59637) are very boggy - the Plan identifies areas which are at risk of flooding as being potentially suitable for development. There would need to be some way to divert this water away from the developed land (eg in relation to site 59637) which could cause damage to existing features such as the pond adjacent to plot 59638.I hope the above considerations will be taken into account. While there are vacant land sites in and around Hadlow, it would seem to me that there are many other potential sites in the Local Plan which would be more suitable for development and more able to accommodate it.Many thanks, Katherine Flux	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59853 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59857 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59601 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59811 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59859 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59410 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42801473	Annex 1	Site Ref: 59811This site is wholly inappropriate for development generally and certainly not for over 2,000 houses. The issues include the following, some of which are noted in the assessment: The site can only be accessed via narrow country lanes There is a lack of essential services - no gas, no mains drainage and electricity supply with low voltage The site seems to take in some of an area of Historic Parks and Gardens and borders a Conservation Area No local amenities / schools / healthcare facilities The area does not border any existing dense housing / the development would interrupt open countryside The development would likely significantly reduce access to Public Footpaths and Bridleways	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42774561	Annex 1	I object to most of the plans put forward, in particular 59842, 59686 and 59638. I object because Hadlow is already a very busy village, especially during week days when it is highly congested. More buildings would only have a negative impact on the roads and safety of residents. All the proposed sites are on greenbelt land, even though there are plenty of brown field sites in the South East. The doctor's surgery is already at capacity and the schools are not big enough to accommodate a large number of new children. Not to mention the negative impact buildings and vehicles will have on the local wildlife in the area. The land is already prone to flooding, which would be made worse by new housing in the area. I absolutely object to any planning of a number of dwellings in our village.	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.
42802177	Annex 1	Site 59591: Residential. [REDACTED] I am responsible for this site. I did not submit it for development. I have no fundamental objection to it being developed, but would wish to be contacted if this is considered likely.	Comment noted.
42802753	Annex 1	59646, 59747, 59806,Very narrow lanes between East Peckham and the sites. Two vehicles often struggle pass pass each other.Many roads to the site flood.The A26 floodsSites fall into flood zones 2 and 3. Sites include grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.The sites are in the catchment area for the Coult Stream and Boroughs Oak Stream, both of which already regularly flood parts of East Peckham.Any surface water discharge from these sites will increase flood risk in East Peckham.Site is Green belt land.Site 59806 completely overwhelms two important heritage assets. If site 59806 is developed, no development should happen east of the A228 (Seven Mile Lane) to protect these assets. Views both of and from St Michaels Church will be ruined. If site 59806 is developed, a strong boundary of green belt must be maintained between it and Peckham Bush. An ancient pilgrimage trail runs through the sites.There is no rail station within 3 miles. Roads to the nearest two stations flood. There is no parking at Beltring station.The Parish of East Peckham has no GP Surgery.The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42800385	Annex 1	Site ref 59806As a resident of a property in Bells Farm Road which lies adjacent to this proposed development site, I am writing to object in the strongest terms to this site being developed as part of the local development plan. The basis for this objection is as follows:1. As mentioned in your report a significant negative to the development of this site is that it has poor accessibility. This is rural land with no infrastructure and the accessibility is poor. Development to this site is not appropriate in the context of the local roads which are already over crowded and in a poor state of repair (Stanford Lane, Bells Farm Road and Martins lane). These roads are already used as rat runs when roads are congested and have a heavy use rendering them dangerous for local users - particularly at time of heavy agricultural use.2. There is no infrastructure on this site and any infrastructure that exists in the immediate vicinity simply does not have capacity to accommodate use by a a further 100 households. There is no mains gas or sewage, power is already prone to faults and broadband in TN125NA is of a 3rd world standard - 1-2mbps at best and should already be an embarrassment to the local authorities. Medical services are poor and overstretched - there are none in East Peckham and the small surgery in Hadlow does a wonderful job but is already at over capacity. Ambulance wait times are long and transport services are intermittent and have been reduced over time. Education services are also already stretched and local residents will know that, despite promises, if houses are built on this rural site no additional infrastructure will be provided as there just is not the necessary local funding available to support it.3 this site is designated a green field site and is on high grade agricultural land as your report discloses - you also acknowledge this correctly as a significant negative. At a point in time when this country is going to face the rising issue of food security, what government would possibly think it makes sense to build over prime agricultural land when there are plenty of other brown field and semi - urban sites available. It makes no sense. This site is a green field site for a reason and it should remain designated as such.4. Your report states that a significant positive is that the site can be used to provide a significant number of houses - this statement is obvious - any wide open rural area is capable of being built on in scale but this will not improve the area and is not an argument for doing so. There is not that capacity for more houses from an	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		infrastructure perspective, it will damage the heritage sites, pilgrims trail and the geo and bio diversity of the area. This is rural agricultural land and a resource that should be preserved. Developing this site will also significantly disrupt a longstanding local community.5. Most will understand the need for additional housing all over the country, however, plans have to be realistic in the context of the space available, the infrastructure and services available, the nature of the land being built on. Tonbridge and Malling is not a large borough and a high proportion consists of rural and agricultural areas. These should be preserved not only because this is a precious resource but also to protect the heritage and integrity of the neighbourhood. With c56k dwellings in the borough it seems excessive to me to have a local plan to increase this number by over 25% (c15k new houses). I do not believe that there is the capacity to add this amount of new homes in the area - services will not increase proportionately and the capacity is simply not there. If it is a necessity then this development should be made on brownfield, urban and semi-urban areas rather than on rural sites with no facilities in the immediate area. I do not believe that this site represents a viable or appropriate development site. Please remove this site reference 59806 from the local development plan. Apart from the truism that houses can theoretically be built on this site, none of the other key considerations (many of which you acknowledge in your own assessment) support its development. On any logical and unbiased basis, development of this site cannot be justified.	
42746977	Annex 1	I wish to object – in the strongest possible terms – to the selection of site 59811 as a potential area for residential development. The area is currently a large swathe of countryside surrounding Oxonhoath and is a significant distance from the centre of Hadlow. The reasons for my objection are as follows: IGNORING TOWN PLANNING BEST PRACTICE ADVICE The structure of the village would become a sprawling mass to the north of Hadlow, with no clear centre. It would be ignoring recent independent advice from Urban Intelligence for Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council (TMBC Urban Capacity Study, July 2022) into potential options for housing which found that “no sites were identified in Hadlow”. VALUABLE COUNTRYSIDE / BIODIVERSE AREA The area is popular with residents of the village – dog walkers and ramblers alike – who use the network of paths on a regular basis. The loss of such a valuable space for the local community would be devastating, particularly given the importance of access to nature for mental health – something which was very important for residents during lockdown. INADEQUATE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE The supporting road network comprises a series of narrow lanes which would be unable support heavy traffic. The main bus network is along the A26 which runs through Hadlow – a significant walk along unlit lanes in the dark, which would be particularly dangerous in the evening. INADEQUATE SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE The existing schools and GP would struggle to support the additional needs of further residents who would be located at a distance from the village centre. AREA SUBJECT TO FLOODING Significant areas of the land are subject to flooding in the winter. This problem will only be exacerbated with more “hard surfaces”, preventing water from draining away. INACCURATE PLANNING Lastly, I am very concerned about the accuracy of the map provided, as there are a number of private houses contained within the area which have not been informed or consulted about this proposal and would be directly affected.	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.
42783297	Annex 1	I wish to register my complete disapproval of the application for proposed development of site No.59811 which comprises the rural area of Park Farm, outside the village of Hadlow, and lying actually astride Common Rd. and bounded by Matthews Lane and the upper parts of Carpenters Lane. This is a very extensive farmed area of historic interest, having been recorded in the Domesday Book and has preserved its nature even throughout the two World Wars, contributing significantly to supporting UK food resources. This continuity marks its value in terms of its CURRENT varied productivity at a time when national food resources are under threat, being vital for our independence. Sustained viability depends on the scale involved, and this is achieved not only by maintaining its scope, in this case for a large very productive dairy herd, but also because it has the capacity to raise feed crops etc. such as maize (this year) UK's FUTURE food productivity is at stake as it depends on enhancing agricultural assets, not depleting them The impact on the wider environment would be significant in view of the long established hedges, mature trees, ponds, orchard platt and watercourses involved. This wildlife is important not only for the wider balance of nature, but as a FREE resource for locals of all ages besides visitors, from dog walkers to riders and cyclists who daily use the combination of lanes and public Rights of Way. Ease of access from the village is crucial particularly for those without transport, whilst the variety of environments from open fields to the super views over the Weald, the historic features around Oxenhoath House offer plenty of alternatives year round, as was the case during lockdowns. The narrow lanes	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		encompassing the application are completely incapable of carrying the implied increase of traffic of all sorts, and the village is unable to provide sufficient parking or shopping for a wider community. Bus services are already limited and confined to the through route Maidstone/Tonbridge because of narrow side roads and could not provide alternative options Poor drainage is a serious intermittent event, with flooding along both Common Rd. and on Carpenters Lane - an annual, unsolved, issue. The map provided is inaccurate in respect of many details, especially relating to private homes along the perimeters for example	
42803265	Annex 1	<p>Site 59665 this is agricultural land and should not be built upon. If planning is consented it will cause further road congestion, light pollution and destroy natural habitat. Site 59600 there is already a huge amount of commercial buildings on this area, further road congestion and light pollution. Site 59709 currently an area of open space, possibly green belt. It would be a shame to lose this green space. Site 59680 this field has been used for grazing of sheep and agricultural use for many many years. Employment on this land would be outrageous. The A20 in this area is a bottle neck at peak times and always busy so additional traffic would make it impossible. Light and noise pollution would occur. Site 59643 & Site 59706 a green area which would be lost causing additional traffic onto the already busy A20 and light pollution. Site 59681 further building on this site would destroy ancient woodland, natural wildlife habitats, cause extra traffic onto the busy A20, light pollution. Site 59880 construction of 132 houses on this land would destroy agricultural land. The site would mean a huge increase of cars accessing the A227 Wrotham by pass road which is an extremely busy and fast road. Site 59830 this huge development would destroy the unique and separate villages of Ightham, Borough Green, Platt, Wrotham and Wrotham Heath. The absolutely huge amount of additional traffic/people etc would be impossible to manage with the infrastructure in place. The light, air and noise pollution would be a huge problem for all. Some of the site land is still being quarried whilst other quarries have been left to successfully re-wild themselves and if development took place it would be a disaster for the wildlife. Site 59881 construction of 238 houses on the agricultural land should not be allowed. The access onto the A227 would be very dangerous and the road is extremely busy in both directions at many times of the day. The light, air and noise pollution would be extreme. This land is also edged with wild areas and is a habitat for many different wildlife - bats, owls and deer are often spotted. Site 59712 the construction of 73 houses would destroy a green field (possibly green belt), a regularly used and popular footpath for local residents.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42784001	Annex 1	<p>Site numbers 59515 and 59516 We live nearby to the above sites in the house my Grandfather lived before us since the 1970s. The land at the above sites has been continuously used by the local community since then - be it for the cubs as the closest outdoor open space; dog walkers (we see them every 15 mins passing through the green); church fetes and activities; and most importantly children playing. The site configuration provides a unique setting set back away from the road, where children can be given a slightly freer reign. The large woodland to the south provides older children the chance to get into the wild still within shouting distance of dwellings, There is nothing similar for thousands of occupants within such easy and manageable reach. Many flats which don't have the benefit of modern NPFA standards rely on this area for amenity space. The site is both surrounded and peppered with mature trees and dwellings at some points 2-3m from the boundary. The combination of constraints - the narrowness; proximity from existing dwellings; vast areas needed for tree protection (which could not be built upon); wildlife corridors (bats and dormice travel along the hedgerow around the site) would significantly constrain any development on there. The site was rightly allocated as a greenspace in TMBC's Managing Development and the Environment DPD 2010 - if anything use of the space with covid restrictions has increased and there seems no logical reason why it should be downgraded from its previous designation - if anything it should be protected. The National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph 99 states that; Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use. None of these criteria would be achieved and therefore we believe the open space should be protected in accordance with the national guidance which is specifically material in this instance. Development of such sites will receive vigorous opposition as development, considering its historic use is wrong - contrary to policy; contrary to moral obligations to</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		retain the few wildlife corridors that exist in our suburban areas; contrary to the health and wellbeing of local residents. The site is cherished by a vast mixed community, this includes people passionate about the location and an intellectually and financially affluent community -which will fight at all levels for protection of the space. We therefore raise our objection to allowing development on these sites and request that they are removed from the local plan as potential development sites and protected as key open space. We also request that such actions are thought through before being considered for allocation again (we have had covid where external close-by spaces were imperative; a cost of living crisis where people don't want to have to dip into their pockets to fight against allocations which really haven't been thought through) and an environmental crisis where we should be looking to protect and retain our green spaces.	
42617505	Annex 1	Comment on Interim Sustainability Appraisal - Annex 1 Comment on Interim Sustainability Appraisal - Annex 1 Site ID 59740 Well you cannot be serious! This would decimate this entire area and add to the misery of residents living with the dreadful Ditton Edge Disaster. For so many reasons. Including. 1. A beautiful area that you will ruin. 2. Enjoyed by countless cyclists and walkers. 3. Will remove a very large area of grade A agricultural land. 4. Will remove a very large area of green space that separates West and East Malling from Kings Hill. 5. It has a roads infrastructure worse than what is about to descend on us all from Ditton Edge.....I could go on and on here....this site cannot in all honesty be being considered as a development site can it? And finally---have you noticed that you are putting virtually ALL development in the north of the borough?	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42793313	Annex 1	Site Nos; 59635, 59637, 59638, 59647, 59686, 59842, 59853 The development of these sites will make Hadlow a satellite residential base for Tonbridge. There is no industry or economy in the area other than seasonal agriculture and the property values will be above those afforded by local residents. The infrastructure within the village is insufficient to support large scale development. Schools, medical facilities, roads are all oversubscribed already and there is congestion caused by extensive traffic on the A26 causing poor air quality for current residents, let alone future. The land surrounding Hadlow is good agricultural land used for crops, orchards grazing and vineyards, all necessary for increasing food production. Loss of these green belt spaces will impact on current residents who enjoy them for health and well being. Many of the sites are susceptible to flooding given the nature of the surrounding terrain with rivers, streams and ponds. Increased development will raise the possibility of increased flooding throughout the village. We strongly object to any major development within and around the village of Hadlow on these grounds.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42806753	Annex 1	Site 59623 This site was refused planning permission for demolition and rebuild of 13 dwellings in March 2022. It is disappointing to see it back on plans (despite the proposed number of dwellings to have shrunk to 5). I do not think this site is suitable for redevelopment for more than 2/3 dwellings due to proximity to the already congested Shipbourne Road roundabout and funnel neck between Yardley Park Road and Portman Place. An increase in vehicles coming and going from this site would be dangerous. There is already a real danger for pedestrians at this roundabout and the crossing on Yardley Park Road. I do not believe this historical building should be demolished. Demolishing it would harm the Tonbridge Conservation Area and not be in keeping with the upper part of Yardley Park Road. The redevelopment of the plot would be overbearing on the adjacent plot. The redevelopment of the plot does not appear to be in keeping with the NPFF.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42817953	Annex 1	I object to housing development in Mereworth	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42818273	Annex 1	Response to Site Proposal Number 59811 - land surrounding Oxon Hoath estate, Hadlow.I strongly object to the proposed site surrounding the Oxon Hoath estate. My objections are based on the following grounds:-1. It fails the Green Belt Development test. The proposed site significantly fails to meet the criteria set out with the National Planning Policy Framework for development within the Green Belt. The NPPF is clear that 'established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified'. This test is not meet. The site sits firmly within the long established Green Belt. The site is rural, surrounded by country lanes, and there's no public transport.2. Flooding. I walk the public footpaths identified in site 58911 frequently. In winter, parts of the area are subject to repeated flooding. If development were to go ahead, given the increase in hard surfaces and associated water run-off, the housing itself and especially housing in Hadlow between the site and the River Bourne would be significantly at greater risk of flooding. In living memory, the entire village centre of Hadlow flooded. 3. Access. The site is in a 'Poor Assessability Band'. There are no walkable train stations. Currently there's no public transport near the site and the single lane access roads in a number of the site's entry points would make the provision of buses problematic. The existing bus service in Hadlow is poor at best. The local road infrastructure can barely support the existing traffic let alone another 150+ dwellings. A number of the roads such as Steers Place are single track. Traffic congestion is already a problem on the A26 through the village and on Carpenters Lane. Road safety and noise pollution are similarly problems.4. Impact on the Environment. In the assessment, insufficient regard has been paid the unique and diverse nature of the wildlife. There is recorded evidence of Greater Crested Newts immediately adjacent to the proposed development in the pond at Mallards on Steers Place some 200 yards south of the proposed site. Greater Crested Newts and their associated breeding grounds are protected by law. Development on the proposed site risks those breeding grounds. Whilst out walking on the public footpaths through the proposed site, I have often and recently seen evidence of bats and badgers. Bats and badgers are similarly protected by law.In summary, the case for the development to be considered for the local plan and/or for planning has not been made. There would be strong grounds for a legal challenge. It would not be appropriate to approve development of this site for the reasons given above and no doubt for other considerations. There are plenty of other sites in Tonbridge and Malling that better fit the criteria. Protracted legal challenge would be costly for the council and easy for the opponents of this site to win.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42771489	Annex 1	All the comments I inserted into the Interim sustainability appraisal Annx 1 have disappeared when I pressed Submit comments.	Comment noted.
39066721	Annex 1	Our response to the sustainability appraisal of sites 59858, 59864 and 59866 is provided within our response to Question 8 of the main consultation	Comment noted.
42823169	Annex 1	I am writing to object against any development on the sites listed below. The reason I am objecting is that I live in Leybourne village, all 5 sites are located in Leybourne village, they are all recreational green land spaces which I, my wife, my children, and my grandchildren, all use on a regular basis and if developed upon it would be detrimental to our well-being and potentially cause mental stress to us all. Please do not approve any development on these sites:Site 59432 (Oxley Shaw Lane)Site 59441 (Castle Way)Site 59442 (Castle Way)Site 59443 (Lillieburn)Site 59445 (Oxley Shaw Lane)	Comment noted.
42824609	Annex 1	I live on Beaver Road and I object to houses being built on site 59852. There is a shortage of green spaces in the area and this site is key for the residents to be able to go for a walk which is imperative for their mental health. I'm addition, there is a shortage of local amenities such as schools and doctors surgeries.Please do not build on this site and maintain it as a village green.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42821889	Annex 1	<p>Site 59613, 59876 and 59837 - These areas are located around Snoll Hatch. We recently purchased a listed property here. The area of the sites in question is on a conservation area, and a character area especially Site 59613 with postcode [REDACTED]. It was especially difficult to buy in this area due to the conservation area status and the fact that the area is in a direct flood path, in zones 2 and 3, meaning insurance companies were difficult to find. We had both surface water flood and general flood warnings from the two rivers nearby appear on our surveys which made our solicitor, surveyor and the insurance companies very hesitant. Even today after rain overnight this area has roads flooded (whereby pavements and roads are impassible) and the local flood warden has had to look at the nearby rivers to assess the risk. There is poor accessibility, when floods have occurred in the area we are stuck and unable to go to the left towards the pound or the right towards little mill. All local roads around the sites flood. Narrow lanes would not cope with any additional footfall or the large machinery that would need to get through, considering in this area existing houses are already on both sides of the road mean the road cannot be extended to be made bigger. There are also parking issues in the locality. The land in question is within the green belt but also goes against the established anti coalescence policy, the hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate and these sites would mean we are not. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. Snoll Hatch as a hamlet should be given rural settlement status. Site 59855, 59650 and 59782 - Hale street is also a historic hamlet that needs to be kept separate from East Peckham. The land in question is all greenbelt with narrow lanes. Building on this land goes against the anti coalescence policy to protect these areas. The lanes are narrow and again have houses on both sides of the road meaning expansion cannot happen. The roads between hale street and village amenities flood, and are in flood zones 2 and 3, the sites then become isolated. Surface water that could be brought on from building in this area will undoubtedly escape to already existing watercourses, which already struggle and cause flooding currently, let alone with water increase which will undoubtedly increase the risk of flooding to other areas downstream. High ground water levels mean soakaways are unlikely to be an option for these sites. Sites 59855 and 59782 both contain the CLH pipeline system. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. Site 59789 and 59682 - This area is in a known flooding area, caused by surface water and natural flooding. A main river the Coult Stream runs through this site and regularly floods, currently in flood zones 2 and 3, even moving this stream could cost flooding to other parts of the local area that already deal with the risk of flooding. There are narrow lanes with poor access. There is very poor accessibility, especially in times of difficulty such as flooding. The site becomes isolated. The site is on greenbelt land and should be conserved for future generations. This land is making Hale Street and East Peckham joined, going against the coalescence policy that requires them to always be kept separate. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. The street lighting is non existent along parts of the local area. Site 59813 - This green belt site creates connection between East Peckham and Hate street going against the coalescence policy to keep the hamlet separate. There are narrow lanes in which the large amount of traffic added through either building or more residents the roads would not cope with. There are properties on each side of the road which will mean that the expansion of facilities for this could not happen on existing roads. This site floods and is in zones 2 and 3. The high ground water levels mean soakaways are likely to be unsuitable, it will also encourage surface water to be displaced and moved further downstream effecting other communities. The CLH fuel pipeline runs through this site. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. Site 59525 - This land is a tiny patch of area, it would not provide the amount of houses needed to justify the disruption of the whole village and local hamlets to build on. It is surrounded by narrow lanes, is isolated in times of flooding. It is surrounded in times of flood and means that it is pretty isolated. It is in flood zones 2 and 3 roads to this area flood, today after heavy rain fall I walked there myself and some of the roads and pavements were underwater.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The site is directly between Snoll Hatch, Bullen Corner, which are all conservation and character areas. the area is already built up meaning that the roads are set as they are and cannot be expanded. The properties in the locality will then be under further strain, such as for light into their house. There are mature trees on this site that would have to be destroyed. The land itself is currently used for the community with singing groups, keep fit, parades, Salvation Army events, football, a safe area for children to play outdoors. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. Sites 59639, 59640, 59753 - this area is especially rural, green belt land, the lanes are particularly small, with sometimes only 1 vehicle sizes and passing points, this would disrupt any one living or commuting in this area. Vehicles often struggle to pass each other. The site itself is in flood zone 1, the entire of bush road floods and all roads to the site also flood. It has very poor accessibility and is so removed in distance from the village that to go to the shop they would have to take a 5 minute car drive, impossible when in times of flooding. The road has no pavement or lighting. High ground water means that soakaways might be unsuitable. Peckham Bush, in which these sites lay is a hamlet that needs to be kept separate from East Peckham. Bush Road holds an animal sanctuary who benefit from the quiet and less frequent traffic that rural living allows. There is an ancient pilgrimage trail that passes through the land, legally allowing those on that pilgrimage to pass through. If this was to be built on there would need to be confirmation and agreement the owners allow the path to permanently be accessible. There are many heritage assets also within 250m of the site. The site is grade 1 and 2 agricultural land which we have been told as constituents should not be built on. The proposed new town next to the A26 will cause further flooding to this area and also others locally. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. Sites 59747, 59806, 59846 - This area is nearly twice the size of east Peckham, adding a lot of strain onto resources of the local area. There are very narrow lanes leading to these sites from East Peckham where often two vehicles struggle to pass each other. The sites fall into flooding zones 2 and 3 and the A26 itself floods. The sites are on grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The area is local to the Coult's Stream and Borough Oaks Stream which both already flood local areas let alone when further surface water is drained into them. The sites are all on green belt areas. There are historical assets locally that these sites would overwhelm. The views of and from St Michaels church will be ruined, there is also an ancient pilgrimage trail which runs through the sites. Peckham Bush and these sites need to be kept separated by greenbelt land to protect the hamlets locally. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. Site 59616 - This site is exactly where water returns to the medway after flooding. Building here could make flood waters worse, higher and longer to clear. The site is in a flood zone 3. The roads to this site flood. The site overlooks residential properties and gardens. The site has the river medway, which floods, directly on its boundary. Branbridges estate must be kept separate from East Peckham. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. Site 59646 - This land is right next to the river medway, it holds this boundary through the whole site. This is a flood plain that helps protect the village of east Peckham. The fields are exceptionally close and help to ensure there is a level of absorption so that the local areas don't get the flooding. Building here could result in other local communities getting the full brunt of the flooding by displacing the water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Road, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would suffer a lot from an increased flood risk. The river Bourne and the river medway meet on this river just up from Snoll Hatch, in a straight line from Little Mill. The site is entirely in flood zone 3. The surface is always very wet. There is massive erosion on the bank of the river and every few months more repairs have to be completed as the river is very wide, very fast and very high. There will be no option of moving this river and extensive work would have to be completed in order to make it workable for building property. East Peckham flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life so would be unable to assess. There is also extreme risk of loss of life during flooding in this area generally.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. The hamlet of Beltring must also be separate from East Peckham and this is putting that into doubt. The area itself is very well used by the community, the war and peace show is a huge addition to the area as well as the various concerts and also the local camping which brings a lot of tourists to the local area. The land it green belt but also green belt that is accessible to everyone historically. Aunts of my partner still remember the routes and children they took through the fields and that was over 70 years ago. The local area also has a variety of nature that should be protected including swans, kingfishers, newts, water voles etc. and building on this site will disrupt that, also the removal of ancient trees will again not help with the flood risk of the area. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.Site 59742 - Is land is green belt. It is in flood zones 2 and 3. It is isolated from the village, especially in times of flooding. The stream on this land runs directly through this land and regularly floods the land, the roads and properties nearby including on Hale street. Any increase in water to this stream will likely increase the flood risk to everyone nearby. There is also a lot of nature nearby including Egrets. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.	
42824993	Annex 1	I am writing to OBJECT against any development on the following sites:Site 59432 - Oxley Shaw LaneSite 59441 - Castle WaySite 59442 - Castle WaySite 59443 - LillieburnSite 59445 - Oxley Shaw LaneI have lived in Leybourne since 1982 with my husband and family. We chose to live here because of the green land open spaces. We continue to enjoy these spaces regularly with our children and now grandchildren. During Covid we also were able to find mental relaxation by visiting these sites, which are on our doorstep.I believe that If these sites are taken away and used for development it would not only be very detrimental to our wellbeing, but also to others, from youngsters to the elderly. My mother, who sadly died during the height of Covid, also lived at Leybourne by herself, found her daily walks where she would meet and chat to many people and that would brighten her day in such a positive way. These spaces are so important for many people, PLEASE do not take them away.	Comment noted.
42821793	Annex 1	Site 59432The area is widely used by local walkers and dog owners as leading down to the local woodland and stream.	Comment noted.
42821793	Annex 1	Site59456This area is widely used as a recreational area as well as having a footpath leading from the Village to Lunsford Lane.	Comment noted.
42821793	Annex 1	Site 59445This area is used for recreation and the children's play area that has been placed by the parish council.	Comment noted.
42821793	Annex 1	Site 59441This is the main recreation area in the village with a play ground and a exercise facility . which are both widely used.	Comment noted.
42732929	Annex 1	We would like to register our objection to the following sites59701, 59834, 59661. As your own report highlights there are significant challenges developing any of these sites, in particular flood risk where sites 59834 & 59661 which are classed as valuable floodplain spend a good proportion of the year underwater as can be witnessed from various available aerial photos. These sites are also greenbelt, green spaces, full of trees (orchards & ancient woodland) which help counter the terrible environmental impact of the awful traffic on Hadlow Road/Cannon Lane/Vale Road. Traffic which would only be added to by any development in these areas on top of the severe challenges of accessibility for these sites. The impact culturally (particularly from sites 59701 & 59661) for Tonbridge would also be irreparable as a result of the spoiling of an ancient lane which holds several historically important sites and listed buildings. As residents we believe that the Lane has contributed sufficiently already to the expansion of Tonbridge with the development of the Industrial Estate along the southern border of the lane to Vale Road. We would also like to note that the existing industrial estates have numerous unused/unlet units, so why the need to expand the commercial site into a currently productive apple orchard escapes us (site 59701). The Lane is also a well used footpath which is readily accessible for Tonbridge residents to escape the urban sphere quickly without having to drive and any further development on the Lane would only discourage its use. We would like to finish by acknowledging the need for development and growth for the area but think it would be beyond a shame to spoil a unique, loved and special part of Tonbridge & Malling.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42814401	Annex 1	Site 59424 DEFRA Forest Inventory Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill - In particular GP Surgery Harm to protected species Outside of the confines of existing developments Impact on Local Residents of main access Impact on wildlife corridor Change of character of the area Loss of public open space Site 59534 Change of character of the area Loss of public open space Site 59544 Harm to conservation areas (nesting bats in particular) Harm to non-listed heritage assets (Gun emplacement), preservation order Site 59547 Harm to conservation areas Change of character of the area Loss of public open space Site 59655 Green Belt Countryside Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, will create a rat run through Kings Hill Outside of the confines of existing developments Loss of agricultural land Traffic restricted on local roads Site 59761 Ancient Woodland (Part of site) Green Belt Countryside Access issues to A228 will cause issues with narrowest part of the road marked Site 59797 Loss of agricultural land Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks Countryside Harm to conservation areas Green Belt Harm to the aquifer for streams Outside of the confines of existing developments =Traffic restricted on local roads Site 59800 Silly consideration as 5 holes of an 18 hole, privately owned, golf course No access to Kings Hill without knocking down houses or further development into Golf Course Outside of the confines of existing developments Harm to the aquifer for streams Countryside Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks Loss of agricultural land Insufficient access via single track Canon Lane for scale of development with no scope for improvement/widening given existing houses and dangerous access point onto a blind corner of A26. Site 59802 No access to Kings Hill without knocking down houses or further development into Golf Course Outside of the confines of existing developments Harm to the aquifer for streams Green Belt Countryside =Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks Loss of agricultural land Insufficient access via single track Canon Lane for scale of development with no scope for improvement/widening given existing houses and dangerous access point onto a blind corner of A26. Site 59844 Change of character of the area Loss of public open space	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42832833	Annex 1	Please see our comments on the relevant objectives submitted in our letter emailed 03.11.22.	Comment noted.
42833057	Annex 1	Site 59646 Hop Farm Land Massively unsuitable for development, greenbelt land with woodland and rare nightingales. Beautiful riverbank that needs to remain part of nature. Zone 3 flood area. Cut off from village in a flood, very close to river Medway therefore a risk to flood wardens. Building will increase risk of Medway and Bourne flooding affecting the whole of East Peckham, and Snoll Hatch in particular.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833057	Annex 1	site 59616 This is where water goes back into river when it floods, therefore this area would not only be at risk of flooding but also disperse flood water further into the village causing more flooding.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833345	Annex 1	The plans for site 59646, Hop Farm land should not be approved because the area is a flood plain and is surrounded by numerous rivers, including the River Medway, the River Bourne and Alder stream. The area regularly floods currently, so adding buildings and houses will only make the flooding worse. These new houses will experience flood damage. It will also have an impact on the village of East Peckham as the water will be pushed into the village. East Peckham already experiences a high level of flooding and the village would not be able to cope with more. More flooding will cause detrimental economic devastation. There are not enough local facilities to support this development. There is no train station, and the closest one is small with limited parking. The local GP surgeries are already under pressure and adding this amount of extra houses will cause problems for not only the current residents but also the new residents at the new site. There are many reasons why this plan should not go ahead. It is an extraordinarily inappropriate site for new housing.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833057	Annex 1	59613 Narrow roads without adequate parking, flood risk area. Green belt area, flood zone 2&3.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833281	Annex 1	site ref 59613 I like other locals are fully against the idea for this and the other sites. The results from such buildings/estates would be catastrophic for the surrounding area. the roads are already narrow and struggle with the volume of traffic. There is no doctors surgery and only 1 school. The land is also green belt and shouldn't be built on. But the biggest issue is due to the flooding in the area, the area already suffers and building on flood plains and fields that help prevent flooding are going to cause untold damage to surrounding houses.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833281	Annex 1	site ref 59837 the proposed plans for this site are a truly horrendous idea. the village cant sustain new estates, the roads are narrow, there is no GP surgery, the site is green belt but the biggest issue is due to the flooding. the area	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		already suffers badly from flooding and building on these fields will make this so much worse and cause so much damage to other houses building on this site is a truly horrendous idea and will cause so much turmoil	
42833281	Annex 1	site ref 59876building on this site is an awful idea. the area cannot support such building/estates. the area is green belt so shouldn't be built on.the village cant support this as the roads are narrow, construction vehicles would cause chaos. there is no gp surgery as it is let alone with however many more people living here. but the greatest issue is the one of flooding. the area already suffers from flooding and building on the surrounding fields will cause untold damage to surrounding houses and peoples lives. please don't build on these sites in and around East Peckham and ruin a wonderful area	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833281	Annex 1	site ref 59646building on this area will cause untold damage to the surrounding areas, the area suffers badly from flooding already and building here in the middle of the flood plains will cause so much damage to the wildlife and surrounding areas	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833345	Annex 1	Site 59806 should not be approved. The site is far too big for the area. There are no suitable services e.g. doctors and transport to support such a large residential site. Such a large site will send large amounts of water to the surrounding areas, areas which are already prone to flooding. By building a large site in this area you are causing flooding to many properties and businesses. The roads are small and can be classed as lanes, they would not appropriate for the large amount of traffic which would come from such a large residential site. The site will cover both agricultural and green belt land. Without agricultural land we will not be able to produce food. Green belt land needs to be protected. There are 2 important heritage assets on this site and an ancient pilgrimage trail. It would be immoral to destroy heritage sites. This site cannot reach the border of East Peckham. It would completely destroy the village.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59447I believe this site should be excluded from going forward as part of the Local Plan as parking in West Mallong town is already under stress and the removal of the carpark this land occupies would be very harmful to the town's continuing prosperity.	Comment noted.
42833345	Annex 1	Site 59813 is not an appropriate site for more housing. The lane is already prone to flooding. Extra housing will cause even more surface water discharge and will cause flooding to current surrounding properties but also to the new homes.Extra traffic on the road is not safe for the children who attend East Peckham Primary School. The Primary School will not be able to cater for the large amounts of children who will move into the site.The village has no GP surgery and no train station. There are not suitable services to provide for a site of this size.	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.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59448Car parking provision is essential for West Mallong town's on going economic success therefore this site should not go forward in the Local Plan as it would lead to the loss of such parking provision.	Comment noted.
42833345	Annex 1	Site 59789 should not be approved. The village of East Peckham already experiences a high amount of flooding. Extra houses right in the centre of the village will cause more surface water and cause flooding in current and new properties.The roads are not large enough for the extra amount of traffic, and the children walking to school will be less safe. The Primary School cannot cater for a large amount of extra children. The village does not have a GP surgery or train station.The site is not easily accessible.	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.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59699 church farmthis is a large area of valuable farmland which would be a significant loss if developed.Enlarging the village into prime greenfield land would ruin the beauty and natural surroundings as well as reduce and have a negative impact on wildlife and the environmentTransport to this area comprises of small country lanes not suitable for the traffic of 260 homes	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59594I believe this site should be excluded from going forward in the Local Plan as it is on Green Belt Lane and is partly within a Conservation Area. It would cause harm to the heritage asset of St Leonards Tower and Mallong Place and lead to the loss of agricultural land. Its proximity to the Lancaster Gate site means that any development would effectively lead to the coalescence of West Mallong and Kings Hill which must be avoided.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833345	Annex 1	Site 59613 is not an appropriate site for development.The area is a flood zone, the houses in this area regularly flood. Extra housing would mean more surface water and therefore more flooding. Current houses would suffer and the new houses will be built to flood.The access to this site is poor. And the current roads cannot cope with more traffic, especially large vehicles needed to built a residential site. All roads to the site currently flood.The area is green belt land which needs protecting.The area of Snoll Hatch is a character area. Adding more houses will destroy the areas beauty,	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		uniqueness and history. Building on this site goes against established coalescence policies. Snoll Hatch is a hamlet and must be kept separate from East Peckham. The village does not have appropriate services to support this development. No GP surgery, a small school. The nearest train station has no parking. Highly inappropriate site.	
42746017	Annex 1	site number 59698 this site off London Rd West Malling. The existing school does not have capacity to cope with extra housing here. This site is very near a wildlife and biodiversity site and would have a negative impact/disturbance upon it.	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.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59602I believe this site should be excluded from the Local Plan going forward as its development to ensure there is no further encroachment on the individual identities of the settlements in and around West Malling and Kings Hill. The whole area in danger of coalescing so further development should be limited. The site is outside the confines of West Malling and would lead to the loss of agricultural land.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59603I believe this site should be excluded from the Local Plan going forward as its development to ensure there is no further encroachment on the individual identities of the settlements in and around West Malling and Kings Hill. The whole area in danger of coalescing so further development should be limited. The site is outside the confines of West Malling and would lead to the loss of agricultural land.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833345	Annex 1	Site 59837 should not be considered for development. There are already significant parking issues along this road. Extra houses will only worsen this problem. There is poor access to the site. The roads cannot support the large vehicles which will be needed to develop the site. The area regularly floods. The roads to the site flood. The new houses would flood and the current houses in the area would flood. The hamlet of Snoll Hatch is protected by policies to keep it separate from East Peckham. The area of Snoll Hatch is a character area, building new houses would destroy this. The village does not have the services to support this new development, No GP surgery and not enough transport links. The closed train station does not have parking.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site number 59672 this site off London Rd West Malling. The existing school does not have capacity to cope with extra housing here. This site is very near a wildlife and biodiversity site and would have a negative impact/disturbance upon it.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59714 this site is prime farmland and developing it would mean it's loss and a negative impact on the environment. Developing this area would have a negative impact on the character of the area.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59645I believe this site should not go forward in the Local Plan. It is on Green Belt land and outside the confines of West Malling. Any development of this site would cause harm to the setting of, and views into, the associated Conservation Area. Additionally it would cause harm to the setting of Douces Manor and St Mary's Church. The agricultural land of this site is a valuable resource which would be lost for ever if developed. The traffic which would be associated with any development of this site is likely to add even more stress to the difficult junction of West Street and the High Street.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59699I believe this site should not go forward in the Local Plan. It is on Green Belt land and outside the confines of West Malling and would lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The traffic which would be associated with any development of this site is likely to add even more stress to the difficult junction of West Street and the High Street.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59716 This site is adjacent to St Leonards Tower which is the oldest part of West Malling and a vital part of English Heritage. Developing this sensitive area would have a negative impact on the character of the area. This beautiful countryside would be lost and would have a negative impact on the ability for the local population to take/use the nearby footpath running past St Leonard's Tower whilst enjoying the harmony of the rural surroundings - developing this area completely changes the character of the surroundings and does not benefit the local population in any way. The extra traffic generated on the roads Offham and Teston would also add to the change of character of the area negatively.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59714I believe this site should not go forward in the Local Plan. It is on Green Belt land and outside the confines of West Malling. Any development of this site would cause harm to the setting of, and views into, the associated Conservation Area. Additionally it would cause harm to the setting of Douces Manor and St Mary's Church. The agricultural land of this site is a valuable resource which would be lost for ever if developed. The traffic which would be	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		associated with any development of this site is likely to add even more stress to the difficult junction of West Street and the High Street.	
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59716Site 59645I believe this site should not go forward in the Local Plan. It is on Green Belt land and outside the confines of West Malling. Any development of this site would cause harm to the setting of, and views into, the associated Conservation Area. Additionally it would cause harm to the setting of Douces Manor and St Mary's Church. The agricultural land of this site is a valuable resource which would lost for ever if developed. The traffic which would be associated with any development of this site is likely to add even more stress to the difficult junction of West Street and the High Street.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833345	Annex 1	Site 59876 is a completely inappropriate site for planning and residential building.Snoll Hatch is a hamlet which is protected by a coalescence policy which says it must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and new buildings will destroy the beauty of the area.The area is in flood zones 2 & 3 and regularly floods. New housing will cause more surface water discharge which will run into the current properties and cause financial damage. Snoll Hatch Road regularly floods, a new development here would be regularly cut off from the village.Snoll Hatch Road already has parking issues, which means the road is narrow and cars cannot pass adjacent to each other. More houses would mean more cars and this problem would worsen. Drivers already drive too fast down this road, so more houses = more cars = more fast drivers and this will make the road unsafe for children.There is barely any street lighting on this road, it is not designed to accommodate a large amount of houses and residents.The site is green belt land, this should be protected. The views would be destroyed. Building here would link Snoll Hatch to the main village so Snoll Hatch would no longer be a hamlet.The village of East Peckham does not have the services to support more residents. There is no GP surgery and limited transport links. The nearest station does not have parking.This site is highly inappropriate.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59733. Kings Hill opposite The CrestDeveloping this land would create an urban corridor between St Leonard's and Kings Hill having a negative impact on the character of the areaNearby biodiversity sites would be impacted which is not acceptableThis site is a long way from amenities and is not near any urban centre. Housing here would be lacking in any focal point/hub/heart. This would force occupants to drive. Local public transport connections is poor. Railway station is far	Comment noted.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59807This site has been refused permission at appeal and should not be taken forward in the local plan process. TMBC has much information about the unsuitability of this site for development which I believe should be incorporated into the assessment process. Development would be detrimental to the setting both of West Malling Abbey and Eden Farm Oast houses, the site is outside the confines of West Malling being located in the countryside. Development would also lead to the irreversible loss of agricultural land.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59807This site has been refused planning permission very recently.It's very near the monastery which holds significant heritage and building on the pasture land would impact negatively and the surroundingsBuilding near the station would create a community hub away from West Malling and so create a satellite town adjacent to the station.This would destroy the nature of the village heart fragmenting the town	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59814This site is next to Site 59807 which has been refused permission at appeal and many of the arguments for the refusal of the Gladman site are also applicable to this parcel of land. Overall I believe Site 59814 should not be taken forward in the local plan process. Development would be detrimental to the setting both of West Malling Abbey and Eden Farm Oast houses, the site is outside the confines of West Malling being located in the countryside. Development would also lead to the irreversible loss of agricultural land.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59814building on this site would mean the loss of designated open spacethe only access is from the A 228 - this would create a bottleneck in what is supposed to be a bypass	Comment noted.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59860The majority of this site has already been refused permission for development on Appeal so I believe TMBC will be in possession of a large and credible body of information to exclude this site from going any further in the Local Plan process. Having said this, reasons for not putting this site forward include that fact that any development would harm the setting of West Malling Abbey, it would cause harm to the Conservation Area, it is in the countryside outside the confines of West Malling and any development would lead to the irreversible loss of agricultural land.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746017	Annex 1	site 59854part of this land has recently been refused planning permission is is very close to the monastery - national heritage, important buildingbuilding here is detrimental the the character of the area and would be a loss of open space to local residents.It is also prime agricultural land which would be lost	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site 59631 Planning permission has already been refused for this site so TMBC should have access to the valid reasons for this refusal which haven't substantially changed. This site is in the countryside and any development would contribute to its increasing urbanisation and I believe it shouldn't go through to the next phase of the Local Plan.	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59860This site has been refused planning permission very recently.It's very near the monastery which holds significant heritage and building on the pasture land would impact negatively and the surroundingsBuilding near the station would create a community hub away from West Malling and so create a satellite town adjacent to the station.This would destroy the nature of the village heart fragmenting the town	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59406This is prime farm land - loss of which is detrimental to the areaAlso the green belt land loss of open space is negative to the local population	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59596building here would mean loss of open space and have a severe impact on the local wood/ environmental habitat/wildlifeThis land is virgin greenbelt and this is a negative impact on the local populationAccess to this site is very poor and adding access/improving to cater for 23 houses would add more to all the points mentioned above	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59648this area is of outstanding beauty and the loss of prime open space greenbelt is detrimental to the population.Prime farmland loss/. far away from any amenities would force people to drive and consequently have a negative impact on the environment	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	site 59649site 59648this area is of outstanding beauty and the loss of open space is detrimental to the population.Far away from any amenities would force people to drive and consequently have a negative impact on the environment	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site reference 59698 I believe there are many reasons for this site to be excluded from further consideration for inclusion in the Local Plan. It is situated within rolling countryside and any development would not only destroy the valuable visual amenity of the landscape it sits within, it would also lead to the irreversible loss of agricultural land and to harm to the setting of the area. Development would also contribute to settlement coalescence between East Malling, West Malling and the smaller local hamlet communities. Furthermore, the access to this site would need to be either via Broadwater Road, which is actually a single track country lane for most of its length or via East Malling village (which has traffic issues already due to volume of traffic and narrow carriageways) and then through Stickens Lane which is another country lane with Quiet Lane status and protections.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	Site Reference 59634Firstly it should be noted that only a small proportion of this site is actually 'brownfield with the majority of the site having Ancient Woodland classification as confirmed by Natural England. At present the woodland setting this site helps maintain a clear demarcation between Kings Hill and Broadwater Farm.The proximity of the site to the narrow country lanes of Lavenders Road and Broadwater Road is concerning as both have Quiet Lane status and are incompletely unsuitable for any additional traffic flows.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42740033	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59639, 59640 & 59753 (All Bush Rd East Peckham)</p> <p>East Peckham is a rural community that consists of nine Hamlets. Established anti-coalescence planning policy dictates that the distinct nature of the Hamlets must stay protected and preserved. The three main rivers of the Borough run through the village, flooding of roads, residential and business properties is a regular occurrence. The entirety of the village of East Peckham, including its constituent Hamlets, is surrounded by land designated as green belt. This is not a suitable site for development because: Site 59639 is green belt and also consists of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The Revised NPPF (2021) indicates at paragraph 137 that openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. The openness of the Green Belt has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect. 'Open' can mean the absence of development in spatial terms, and it follows that openness can be harmed even when development is not readily visible from the public realm.</p> <p>The Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) states the Hamlets of East Peckham must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. Developing site 59639 will contribute to adjoining Peckham Bush to East Peckham and therefore be in opposition to current anti-coalescence policy. Roads that access site 59639 are unlit, very narrow and have no pavements. To the north is Stanford Lane and Bullen Lane, both of which can flood. Bush Rd, from which the site is accessed, is also narrow and floods during heavy rainfall. To the South is Church Lane that regularly floods and is impassable during periods of heavy rain.</p> <p>Ground water tables are high in this area. A recent application for a major development on the nearby Church Lane (ref 21/03353/FL highlighted the unsuitability of SuDS as there is not enough clearance between maximum groundwater levels and the underside of soak ways. Site 59639 may need considerable ground build up (500mm) to achieve the minimum clearances as stated in the SuDS Manual. This will have the knock-on effect of displacing surface and flood water into existing properties. An animal sanctuary is within 100 metres of site 59639 and development would harm the nature and environment in which these animals reside. Site 59639 has an ancient pilgrimage trail running directly adjacent to it and is close by to many heritage assets. There is a proposed new town on the A26, sites 59806 and 59811, should these sites be developed the Bush Rd area will become at risk of serious flooding by the proposed new town directly uphill from site 59639.</p> <p>The nearest train station is 2.7km from the site, and is not a commuter station. The roads to it are narrow, without lighting or pavement and regularly flood making it impassable to pedestrian and vehicle. There is no parking at the station. No booking office. No telephone. No toilets. No wheelchair availability. No step free access. No accessible taxis. No impaired mobility set down and no staff.</p> <p>The 6000-8000 homes being built in the Capel and Paddock Wood developments are within 3 miles of East Peckham. This will cause flooding and traffic issues within East Peckham as well as place huge strain on infrastructure. This housing will meet need in the East Peckham area, and to build more locally will completely overwhelm the area in every way imaginable. Flooding, traffic and housing need calculations from the Capel and Paddock Wood developments to be taken into account whilst considering site 59639. Due to the reasons outlined above, East Peckham Parish Council does not consider that this site is suitable for development, and should not be included as part of the Local Plan. It would destroy green belt and increase flooding risk. The ground water levels are unsuitable for the use of SuDs. Anti-coalescence policy also dictates the site is unsuitable. The surrounding roads and lanes are very narrow, and regularly flood from numerous sources. East Peckham has lost important infrastructure in recent years, most notably the GP Surgery, pubs and the bakery. There is no accessible commuter railway station. East Peckham should no longer be classed as a Rural Service Centre. Should site 59639 be chosen for development, East Peckham Parish Council would expect sequential testing to evidence that there is no more suitable site for development elsewhere within the Borough.</p> <p>Site 59753 is green belt and also consists of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The Revised NPPF (2021) indicates at</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>paragraph 137 that openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. The openness of the Green Belt has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect. 'Open' can mean the INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL CONSULTATION: 59753 Bush Road 42 P a g e absence of development in spatial terms, and it follows that openness can be harmed even when development is not readily visible from the public realm.</p> <p>The Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) states the Hamlets of East Peckham must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. Developing site 59753 will contribute to adjoining Peckham Bush to East Peckham and therefore be in opposition to current anti-coalescence policy.</p> <p>Roads that access site 59753 are unlit, very narrow and have no pavements. To the north is Stanford Lane and Bullen Lane, both of which can flood. Bush Rd, from which the site is accessed, is also narrow and floods during heavy rainfall. To the South is Church Lane that regularly floods and is impassable during periods of heavy rain.</p> <p>Ground water tables are high in this area. A recent application for a major development on the nearby Church Lane (ref 21/03353/FL highlighted the unsuitability of SuDS as there is not enough clearance between maximum groundwater levels and the underside of soak ways. Site 59753 may need considerable ground build up (500mm) to achieve the minimum clearances as stated in the SuDS Manual. This will have the knock-on effect of displacing surface and flood water into existing properties. An animal sanctuary is within 100 metres of site 59753 and development would harm the nature and environment in which these animals reside. Site 59753 has an ancient pilgrimage trail running directly adjacent to it and is close by to many heritage assets. There is a proposed new town on the A26, sites 59806 and 59811, should these sites be developed the Bush Rd area will become at risk of serious flooding by the proposed new town directly uphill from site 59753.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42586305	Annex 1	<p>TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL</p> <p>CONSULTATION ON REGULATION 18 LOCAL PLAN</p> <p>OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED SITE 59494, THE LAKES, ME20 6GZ</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>I am writing to object to the inclusion of Site 59494 at The Lakes, Larkfield, ME20 6GZ, within the TMBC Local Plan.</p> <p>My wife, three children and I have lived at [REDACTED] since the house was first built in 2004. Two of my children are now at secondary school in Maidstone, one of whom has mobility difficulties due to cerebral palsy.</p> <p>Berkeley Homes built The Lakes estate under strict planning permission conditions which included creating improved amenity for the local community by opening up access to the adjacent gravel lakes accompanied by significant investment in the associated local environment. The resulting Leybourne Lakes Country Park has flourished over the last 20 years it has been in existence, and the wider community is benefiting as intended.</p> <p>A large attraction of the development to us was the open nature of the estate itself with plots spaced in a way that maximises a feeling of airiness. The development's design was very much conceived with the large landscaped grass 'village green' at its centre. Everyone who visits us at the estate for the first time always comments on how wonderful it is.</p> <p>A significant reason for us moving to The Lakes was because the no.71 bus to Maidstone had a terminal bus stop on the estate at Site 59494. This made it convenient for my wife who doesn't drive to get our three children to and from school in a sustainable way. This was particularly important given my disabled daughter has mobility difficulties. However, the bus service was unfortunately discontinued by Arriva from the estate several years ago, and the bus shelter removed. My family now have to walk the extra distance over to Tesco's bus stop via the spine road in front of Site 59494, and so their safety is of utmost concern to us in the face of Site 59494's potential development.</p> <p>The proposed building of 20 houses / flats on this grass 'village green' area, completely removes the 'heart' of our estate, and would bring with it multiple disadvantages which I set out further in my objections below:</p> <p>MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS</p> <p>The TMBC planning portal sets out matters which are taken into account when considering planning applications. I have used the stated sub-headings to structure my response below.</p> <p>Local, strategic, regional and national planning policies and any previous planning decisions:</p> <p>The land at Site 59494 was always intended by the developers Berkeley Homes as an area of visual and recreational amenity for The Lakes estate. In the intervening 20 years, there has been no intention whatsoever of development on the site which is still owned by Berkeleys. The inclusion of Site 59494 within the new Local Plan as a place for new houses would completely renege on the premise of the original planning consent, and ignores the substantial local amenity enhancements already achieved at Leybourne Lakes Country Park, made possible in the first place through the funding generated partly by home-buyers on the estate such as myself.</p> <p>Whether the proposed use is a suitable one for the area, taking into account noise, smell, disturbance resulting from the use:</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>There would clearly be an increase in noise and disturbance on the estate by shoe-horning 20 additional homes into its centre. Significantly, traffic, parking and safety of pedestrians are major factors, covered by my responses under the appropriate sub-headings below.</p> <p>Design, appearance, materials, layout and density of buildings:</p> <p>The layout and density of any proposed design incorporating 20 houses / flats onto Site 59494 would instigate a considerable change of use of the land, one for which the estate was not originally planned. The loss of the central 'village green' would transform its appearance for the worse, and inevitably create a feeling of over-crowding. The loss of the substantial grassed area could create additional surface run off, and together with the additional wastewater loading from the properties, could overload the existing drainage and wastewater system, which was unlikely to have been designed for this eventuality. Also, construction of additional access for the properties on to the estate's principal spine road will impose major change to the current configuration with detriment to wellbeing, health and safety of current residents.</p> <p>Significant overshadowing, overlooking or loss of privacy:</p> <p>The loss of the central 'village green' at Site 59494 to houses or flats would clearly cause overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy to all existing surrounding properties. This completely goes against the original architecture of the estate which was based on properties built around and facing on to the 'village green'.</p> <p>Highway safety, parking, access and traffic generation:</p> <p>Any development at Site 59494 would have an enormous negative impact on highway safety, parking, access and traffic. The road arcing around the periphery of Site 59494 is the principal spine road providing access to all vehicles entering / leaving the estate for the entire 310 existing properties. The road is also used for parking by many residents, meaning it is frequently necessary to weave around parked cars with only room for single-file traffic. At present, drivers have a clear view across the 'village green' in both directions which eases this situation, enabling vital visual communication between drivers, so that vehicle blockages are avoided. Likewise, pedestrians and other road users also benefit from this open visibility. Construction of 20 houses / flats on Site 59494 would inevitably block this vital visibility, with detriment to the safety of road users and pedestrians. Also, the additional vehicular access on to the spine road for the new houses or flats would exacerbate the safety risks and likely reduce the existing parking capacity available along the spine road. Additionally, it is unlikely that sufficient off-road car parking would be generated for the new 20 houses / flats, putting yet more pressure on roadside parking. The resulting bottleneck would create permanent frustration, and could hinder access for the local council waste collection services, emergency response services, and also larger delivery vehicles that have become a regular part of ordinary life. Clearly, the overall impact would be significantly detrimental to the wellbeing and health and safety of existing residents and visiting road users. My family is personally affected as my children, including my disabled daughter, use this route daily to walk to the Tesco's bus stop to get to and from school.</p> <p>Visual effect on the landscape, nature conservation, loss of trees or hedgerows:</p> <p>The grass area at Site 59494 is used by many residents as a place to relax, their children to play, and provides general visual amenity to passers-by. Residents contribute through monthly estate management fees to its upkeep, and significant effort is invested to maintaining the landscaping of the area for the benefit of all. The visual impact of constructing 20 houses / flats on Site 59494 and resultant loss of the 'village green' for the estate would be considerable, transforming the feel of the estate from one of openness to one of over-crowding. As already mentioned, the change of use of the land would lead to loss of permeable grassed surface, and could exacerbate loadings of surface</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>water runoff putting further pressure on drainage systems which in turn could cause flooding both on the estate or further afield.</p> <p>Effect on a conservation area or any historic buildings and local archaeology:</p> <p>No effect that I am aware of.</p> <p>Size and location of proposed advert signs:</p> <p>Not relevant.</p> <p>SUMMING UP</p> <p>I have set out above my objections to the inclusion of Site 59494 in the new Local Plan. The benefits of the proposed development for the occupants of the additional 20 houses / flats are completely outweighed by the detrimental effect on the wellbeing and safety of the occupants of the 310 existing properties on the estate, members of the public passing through the estate, the wider community, and local amenity. Site 59494 must not be included in the new Local Plan.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42604513	Annex 1	<p>Comments in relation to Proposed development: site 59525</p> <p>i purchased my property in [REDACTED] in East Peckham with a huge factor of the surroundings. The road is near the edge of the village with orchards and footpaths. We liked the green outside the house as it leaves a nice open space to the area. Our garden is east facing meaning the sun sets out to the front of our property which is west facing. With development out on this area, it would take light from the front of our property which actually results in the front of our house being warm by the natural elements in sunny days. The last thing we would want as owner of this property is to overlook built up houses or flats.</p> <p>parking is a big concern in this road with about a third of the properties having driveways, leaving less room for households to park on the road. People often resort to half parking on the green to bring their cars more off the road. Currently cars have to park so close together, it has always been a concern for emergency vehicles getting through. When driving through you can slowly edge a car at times but if an ambulance or fire engine had to drive along they would encounter difficulties. The arch in the road makes parking difficult and will only get worse with more residents if a build is agreed.</p> <p>Their is community spirit at times throughout the year including use of the green, this comes from orchestral performances from the local Salvation Army, children playing, people chatting, walking dogs and this summer fitness classes being held in the green. Building on this site would take this community spirit away.</p> <p>East Peckham is a high risk flood area and although I do not believe this road has flooded it has been cut off to one end and the other end being cut of due to huge floods within the village. Taking away established trees which are on the green, along with the grasses area will take away natural soak away areas to a broom that runs along Westwood Road resulting in an increased risk of flooding to the tea of these properties that edge the brook.</p> <p>I would also like to point out the extra traffic that would be caused within the whole village which is already an issue around the local shops and the local primary school, increasing the risk of potential danger. The area is not street lit. The nearby train station is a 45 minute walk, with Jo street lighting, no pathway and is very dangerous. This station also has no parking. The next station has parking but it would add traffic to another village that has also been subject to extra building development.</p> <p>Local bus services are constantly being threatened with cuts to services or complete elimination which would make the village more isolated, with no access to two nearby hospitals or the nearest GP surgeries as there is not one on the village or a dental practice.</p> <p>I therefore oppose any development to the area, but particularly to this proposed site.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42610977	Annex 1	<p>Hi Good Afternoon</p> <p>My name is [REDACTED]. I like peace and quiet here and I love to walk around the village with my kids.</p> <p>I just want to say NO for new buildings in Hale Street sites 59855 59782 and 59660.</p> <p>Here is some examples of why I don't want new houses.</p> <p>Narrow lane</p> <p>Site is in flood zone 2and 3</p> <p>Roads between the village and the side flood.</p> <p>There is no railway closes by.</p> <p>The village has no GP.</p> <p>High ground water level mean the use of soakaway likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Side is green belt area.</p> <p>Kind regards [REDACTED]</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721057	Annex 1	<p>[REDACTED] Westwood Rd, site 59525</p> <p>This site should be designated a green space.</p> <p>Developing the site would be detrimental to health and well-being of the community.</p> <p>This site is regularly used by the community for singing groups, keep fit sessions, parades, Salvation Army events, football, children playing, a place to sit and be within nature, dog walking, a place to meet and socialise, a place for those with no gardens, a safe place to meet in an emergency, a place for the air ambulance to land.</p> <p>It is a safe place for children from Westwood to play and stay within safe view of parents.</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>My son (age 6) says 'I play with my remote control cars out on the green' 'I play with Oscar from nextdoor with his remote control planes and cars'</p> <p>Parking problems are already and issue with many houses in Westwood Road having multiple vehicles and no driveways.</p> <p>Of an evening, when everyone is home from work the road is so full of parked cars that an emergency vehicle would not fit through.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc).</p> <p>Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas.</p> <p>Water pressure problems.</p> <p>Water meter problems.</p> <p>Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight.</p> <p>Would destroy mature trees.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should definitely be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement, we do not have the community facilities to be a rural service centre.</p>	
42721217	Annex 1	<p>Site 59525</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>This site should be designated a green space.</p> <p>Developing the site would be detrimental to health and well-being of the community.</p> <p>This site is regularly used by the community for singing groups, keep fit sessions, parades, Salvation Army events, football, children playing, a place to sit and be within nature, dog walking, a place to meet and socialise, a place for those with no gardens, a safe place to meet in an emergency, a place for the air ambulance to land (anything else you can think of)</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc).</p> <p>Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas.</p> <p>Water pressure problems.</p> <p>Water meter problems.</p> <p>Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight.</p> <p>Would destroy mature trees.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement</p> <p>it is a safe space for local children to play where no main roads need to be crossed</p> <p>it is used for exercise by many older residence with mobility issues</p> <p>this is a community space and used by all ages for many occasions such as christmas, jubilee and remembrance day</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42059873	Annex 1	<p>I object to the fact that sites near the village of Eccles have been wrongly classified as being close to healthcare facilities. All healthcare facilities are scheduled to relocate to Peters Village long before the Local Plan will be adopted. Those facilities will not be accessible by public transport.</p> <p>I object to the fact that some sites near the village of Eccles have been classified as being accessible to a bus stop. A bus stop is of little consequence without a basic daily bus service. The bus service has been reduced to two return journeys per week. It is insufficient to support travel for employment. It only allows two visits a week to Maidstone and the turnaround time is too short to realistically permit many activities (such dental appointments, bank interviews or eye tests). Public transport journeys into and then beyond Maidstone are not feasible since there is no possibility of a return journey.</p> <p>I request that the sites near the village of Eccles should be reappraised for their accessibility status under SA2 in light of any changes undertaken in response to the forgoing objections.</p>	<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.</p>
42140737	Annex 1	<p>You must leave the last remaining open spaces on Kings Hill alone. The two green spaces along Tower View are for the children of the estate please, there's already issues with youths. Leave the kids some green open space.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42329793	Annex 1	<p>A neighbour has alerted myself and neighbours about the local plan...</p> <p>I am disgusted to even see that Brindlesfield play area would even be a consideration. It's the only play area this end of town (are you really going to take the only play area away , even though there will be more children in the area). To build along Chaucer gardens would also be ridiculously it would be so close to people's properties, not acceptable!!!! To plan to build on green belt land was beyond ridiculous and shows how the council no longer care about there town.</p> <p>To keep trying to build this end of town will make it over crowded, parking is already crazy due to college and schools , even buses often struggle getting up this way due to parking</p> <p>To build on top of people's homes like this is unacceptable!! It's about time the council started looking out of town instead of ruining people's lives by building on top if their homes.</p> <p>South Tonbridge is already feeling cramped. With the plans you already have it won't be long before South Tonbridge comes to a standstill.</p> <p>Gone are the days were play areas were very important to the local council.</p> <p>Why was permission given for the new units on the old royal mail site, that was a large site and would've been perfect for many apartments and not on top of people's homes!!</p> <p>There are other areas you could look at out of town . We will fight to keep this play area Infront of our homes. It's not necessary to build so close to residents homes there are other areas!!! You do cover malling aswell. It does feel like Tonbridge is taking a large bulk of these builds and your ruining what was once a nice town.</p> <p>If you built more outside of towns people wouldn't object so much to new builds.</p> <p>It about time you started looking at the impacts on residents rather than easy options .</p> <p>I really hope this area will be taken off the plan</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42213665	Annex 1	<p>Re: Site numbers 59740 and 59740</p> <p>The development of large and medium sized sites on land which is currently used for agricultural purposes should be avoided. Reasons for this include securing national food production capability, maintaining biodiversity, reducing flood risk, reducing greenhouse gases, maintaining green corridors between settlements and preventing urban sprawl.</p> <p>Re: Site numbers 59824,59698,59743,59726, 59631,59636</p> <p>The development of sites which are currently large areas open /green space should be opposed to prevent urban sprawl which will have the effect of merging separate and distinct locales. Development of the above-mentioned sites would be particularly damaging and lead to the potential creation of one continuous urban spaces linking East Malling, West Malling, Kings Hill, Wateringbury, Leybourne and Larkfield.</p> <p>Re: Site numbers 59634,59655,59807,59814</p> <p>In my opinion there should be no further northward development of Kings Hill for the same reason.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42444161	Annex 1	<p>56971- one of its proposals dictates that as the site is within a certain distance to a train station, it could be viewed as a positive option for development on eco grounds however I don't feel enough account has been taken in the amount of trees which will be lost, which are the very thing which will help with emissions</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42469089	Annex 1	<p>Further to the meeting at Borough Green ,attended by the head of Tonbridge and malling planning department and local parish councillors. I must say I was very disappointed at the locals turn out considering we are all against new development ! There are around 6000 residents but only the usual ones turn up approximately 40 people . If people are so against this local plan in BG then there shouldn't of been any standing room.The parish council have arrange for templates of answers they believe should answer these so called questions on this article 18 local plan consultation. This is not appropriate I believe and it's not a honest opinion of the people. They do not like change and are constantly against any new developments. This is why no new housing has been built . I'd be interested in knowing actually the number of new houses built in the last 2 years in the district of Tonbridge and Malling. No one want new homes on there door step but borough green really does have a lot going for it !</p> <p>1 Great train service to London with a new service starting December so that we can now travel to London Victoria, London Bridge , Charring Cross , Blackfriars. It was funny that BG meeting showed a packed train in India and that he'd felt our train service was like this for his commute to London. To be realistic commuters only really commute twice a week and more people than ever now work from home .</p> <p>2 Great road links on our door step .</p> <p>3 A secondary School which is building a new school on the same site which will be able to increase numbers of pupils . This wasn't mentioned at all .</p> <p>4 The need for first time homes / flats . Even a supported living accommodation for our elderly.</p> <p>5 The BG surgery has room to extend if more homes were built . Etc etc</p> <p>The head of planning Matt mentioned that Tonbridge would be ideal to put more homes as they have the infrastructure, but then in another breathe ... Tonbridge floods !</p> <p>It would be great to see green belt and ANOB lines move, it's incredible that ugly looking sand pits etc are in this class. We need to grow and create a great place to live for us and our children.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42446849	Annex 1	I am against this planning, due to potential flood-risk this will pose on the area.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Local Plan development strategy will also be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment that takes all forms of floding into account.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42470113	Annex 1	<p>Regarding sites: 59650, 59782 & 59855</p> <p>I oppose these lands being used for development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high chance of flooding in the area- the area is already a flood plane and this will impact both current and (if these plans proceed) future residents and businesses. - significant negative impacts on local residents. Roads are already too busy, not enough shops, GPS schools etc. - East Peckham is a rural settlement without the infrastructure to support large developments. <p>Please do not add further pressure to an already overflowing area.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes including flood risk via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42444929	Annex 1	<p>Site number 59616</p> <p>In response to the proposed site being built on for an industrial unit I object on the following grounds:</p> <p>The site floods, the site is green belt, real risk of water displacement back to residential houses when it floods. Destruction of wildlife habitat. Removal of trees also increases risk of flooding local area. Already have industrial units that are empty and available for lease in EP, so no need for more units!!</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42469729	Annex 1	<p>To all sites in East Peckham, these are not sustainable or suitable. The area is a rural settlement and does not have the facilities to support the growth. In addition it is green belt land that is risk of flooding.</p> <p>I would like to draw particular attention to sites on Hale Street; 59650, 59782, 59855.</p> <p>I live on Hale Street the and the proposed developments would have a significant impact on my home. My house connects to site 59855 but is 1 metre lower than the surface level (we have steps up in the garden). Should this be built on their would be an increase risk of flooding which is already high. We have to buy specialist insurance due to the current flood risk. In addition, the site has an oil pipe within the ground that restricts building.</p> <p>All 3 sites negatively impact the environment, displacing animals and development would not enrich the area. These sites are not suitable, however should they be considered further we would need to be directly consulted as they all have significant negative impact to us.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
25315361	Annex 1	<p>If I am reading the map correctly, site 59381 is currently part of a vineyard. All land suitable for viticulture in the Borough should be reserved for that purpose. Such land is relatively rare and would typically expect to have an economic value in terms of revenue per acre which exceeds that of Grade 1 agricultural land.</p> <p>Site 59381 is prominently visible from the North Downs AONB.</p>	Comment noted
42407553	Annex 1	Safe Cycle path from west Malling to Tonbridge town centre and another to Twells. Let's encourage folks out of their cars.	Comment noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42511361	Annex 1	<p>Site ID: 59720</p> <p>I strongly object to this development as the proposed entrance at Fen Pond Road is unsuitable due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fen Pond Road is too narrow and speed that vehicles travel down the road would increase the potential for accidents. b. There is no pavement or walkways to the centre of the village, schools or transport links c. The development of 198 houses could create c400 cars, Fen Pond Road is unsuitable for that volume of vehicles. d. the development area is surrounding by woodland is within an AONB. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42511361	Annex 1	<p>Site ID: 59793</p> <p>I object to the development outlined above.</p> <p>This development does not support my preferred Option 1 in the strategic plan.</p> <p>The development would impact woodland area and is within the boundaries of an AONB so should not be considered.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42511361	Annex 1	<p>Site ID: 59872 & 59871</p> <p>I strongly object to the two proposed developments above.</p> <p>Both of these developments would enter and exit via Fen Pond Road.</p> <p>Fen Pond Road is too narrow and speed that vehicles travel along the road would increase the potential for accidents.</p> <p>The entrance/exit is close to an historic building Ightham Church and housing would not be appropriate to this location.</p> <p>The development is also in an AONB.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42560033	Annex 1	59802 - Object due to green belt land, harm to quite lane and rural road network	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42560033	Annex 1	<p>Site 59531 - Object due to traffic impact, change of use of the area, loss of open space</p> <p>Site 59534 - Object due to change of character of the area, increased traffic, loss of open space</p> <p>Site 59544 - Object due to Harm to conservation area, harm to non-listed heritage assets</p> <p>Site 59802 - Object due to green belt, harm to the aquifer for streams</p> <p>Site 59800 - Object due to green belt</p> <p>Site 59655 - Object due to green belt and it being outside of confines of existing settlement</p> <p>Site 59634 - Object due ancient woodland and TPOs</p> <p>Site 59630 - Object due to proximity of ancient woodland, traffic implications on access roads</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42273793	Annex 1	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 59685 * 59690 * 59693 * 59721 * 59805 * 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. * They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A). The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. * The importance of domestic food production has been highlighted by the recent food shortages cause by the war in Ukraine. * Local food production is made more important by the effects of climate change. * They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. * Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. * Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. * Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. * Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. * There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. * These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. <p>Dealing with each site in turn:</p> <p>Site 59685 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE with MINOR POSITIVE</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. * This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office, and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows.</p> <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Site is in a rural setting, NOT on the edge of a settlement. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape when viewed from all sides.</p> <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Cuckoo Lane and the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. * The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request.</p> <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <p>* The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV.</p> <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59690 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. * Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value.</p> <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: AGREE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p> <p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. * This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows.</p> <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape.</p> <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane. Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect.</p> <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <p>* The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV.</p> <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as negative</p> <p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59693 (Residential)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility.</p> <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>SA Objective 4: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. * This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows.</p> <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape.</p> <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. * The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request.</p> <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <p>* The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV.</p> <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development would depend on this site highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59721 (Residential)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility.</p> <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. Should be rated as neutral or negative.</p> <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Loss of this currently unfarmed land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. * This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows.</p> <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* There are houses in close proximity to the site. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape.</p> <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Water run-off from this site has added to that from adjoining sites and previously caused serious flooding on the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect.</p> <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <p>* The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and should be producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV.</p> <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development would depend on this site highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59805 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. * Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value.</p> <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Practical access to most parts of the site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school.</p> <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p> <p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. * This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows.</p> <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape.</p> <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane, Cuckoo Lane and the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. * The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request.</p> <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <p>* The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV.</p> <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59809 Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. * Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value.</p> <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. * This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows.</p> <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape.</p> <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane. Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect.</p> <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <p>* The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. We observe that grade 3A land is also classified as BMV.</p> <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <p>* Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities.</p> <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p>	
42588929	Annex 1	<p>I should like to comment on the following sites;-</p> <p>59645 Outside of the village boundry</p> <p>59699 Lack of facilities, i.e no GP, no room in schools</p> <p>59714 Within Greenbelt or on Greenfield or Top Grade agricultural Land</p> <p>59716 Close to a conservation area and historical place of interest</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42589889	Annex 1	<p>Site ID: 59720.</p> <p>I strongly object to this development, the proposed entrance at Fen Pond Road is unsuitable due to the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fen Pond Road is too narrow and speed that vehicles travel down the road would increase the potential for accidents. b. There is no pavement or walkways to the centre of the village, schools or transport links. c. The development of 198 houses could create c400 cars, Fen Pond Road is unsuitable for that volume of vehicles. d. The development is surrounded by Woodland and is within an AONB. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42589889	Annex 1	<p>Site ID: 59871 & 59872</p> <p>I strongly object to the two proposed developments above.</p> <p>Both of these developments would enter and exit via Fen Pond Road. Fen Pond Road is too narrow and the speed that vehicles travel along would increase the potential for accidents. The entrance /exit is close to the historic building of Ightham church and housing would not be appropriate to this location.</p> <p>The development is also in an AONB so should not be considered.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42589889	Annex 1	<p>Site ID:</p> <p>I object to the development outlined above.</p> <p>This development would impact woodland area and is within the boundaries of an AONB so should not be considered.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42196289	Annex 1	<p>The following sites should NOT form part of the local plan</p> <p>59716 - ME19 6RF - This site is a greenfield greenbelt site. St Leonards Tower is at the boundary of the site. It contains high grade agricultural land. It was deemed unviable in the previous local plan and therefore not submitted. Would add pressure to the road infrastructure around west street in west malling and GPs and School facilities. Lack of pedestrian walk ways along Offham Road. Sits outside of the current west malling village envelope.</p> <p>59699 - ME19 6NN - This site is a greenfield greenbelt site that contains grade 1 agricultural land. It sits outside of the current village envelope of west malling. The topography of the site would significantly impact the current rural character of the area as the elevation of the site would be visible from Teston Road and from St Leonard's Tower. Neither the road infrastructure through west street and along Offham road nor local GP services and schools could support such a significant development. This site was deemed unviable in the previous local plan and therefore not submitted.</p> <p>59645 - ME19 6RE - This site is a greenfield greenbelt site. Planning permission has recently been refused for this site and it was deemed unviable in the previous local plan.</p> <p>59714 - ME19 6RD - This site is a greenfield greenbelt site. Development here would add pressure to the road infrastructure along West Street and Offham Road and on GP and School facilities.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42613569	Annex 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The roads to the station flood. * There is no parking at nearest station. * Snoll Hatch is a Character Area, any new build houses will damage and devalue the aesthetic of the existing properties. * Site is Green belt land. * Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property. * All roads to the site flood. * Poor accessibility. * Narrow lanes, unsuitable for large equipment and high traffic. * Existing Parking problems. * Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. * Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. * High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area. * Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. * There is no rail station close by. * There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. * Regarding Development sites on Snoll Hatch and Addlestead sites 59613, 59876 and 59837. All 3 sites are completely unacceptable and inappropriate for development for the following reasons: * The village has no GP Surgery. <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42469729	Annex 1	<p>Hale St sites 59855, 59650 and 59782</p> <p>These sites should not be considered for development for the following reasons:</p> <p>Sites are located on a flood plain. Roads between the village and the site flood. Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream, with houses built in the area currently on lower ground area. High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area. Site is Green belt land. Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system. There is no rail station close by. There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>narrow lanes and a road network that cannot support more traffic. There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. The roads to the station flood. The village has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	
42594625	Annex 1	<p>I am against local planning - Regulation 18 for</p> <p>Rev: 59876</p> <p>Rev: 59837</p> <p>Rev: 59613</p> <p>As most land around us in Snollhatch floods and comes under the conservation area, it is definitely not suitable to go ahead with any new buildings.</p> <p>We have to remember we are a village and work hard to protect our beautiful surroundings and all the natural habitat that we share it with.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25408257	Annex 1	<p>Regarding Development sites on Snoll Hatch and Addlestead sites 59613, 59876 and 59837. All 3 sites are and Most of East Peckham are completely unacceptable and inappropriate for development for the following</p> <p>Narrow lanes, unsuitable for large equipment and high traffic.</p> <p>Existing Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area, any new build houses will damage and devalue the aesthetic of the existing properties.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42610113	Annex 1	<p>Site 59782 - TOTAL OBJECTION</p> <p>The plot is Greenbelt and is directly behind the cottages know as Orchard Court. A privately owned set of 7 dwellings know as Orchard Court Residents Association.</p> <p>Building on this plot of greenbelt land will cause increased traffic on what is already a narrow and busy road. Increased fumes and pollution. Traffic already makes my property shake and has caused cracks.</p> <p>Also I would also like to make the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. * The roads to the station flood. * There is no parking at nearest station. * Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system. * Site is Green belt land, as mentioned above. * Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream. * Roads between the village and the site flood. * Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. * Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding. * High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area. * Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham. * There is no rail station close by. * There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station. * The village has no GP Surgery. <p>Finding out about this planning is causing me to have high anxiety about the future - to include my health and value of my home. I purchased my property in the location on purpose as I knew that the land around / behind is Greenbelt.</p> <p>I understand you have a quota to complete annually, but this is not a location that would would benefit, more so this would be detrimental to the local properties and indeed the village.</p> <p>Please do not let this proceed.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42590337	Annex 1	<p>Site 59837</p> <p>As commented on the larger site 59613:-</p> <p>Access is poor onto a narrow road with poor turning and poor visuals.</p> <p>The area identified is higher than the surrounding roads and properties. When we had flooding in East Peckham this entire site was a 'lake'. Snoll Hatch Road had become a river- deep, impassable and fast flowing. If this site was used for housing, all the water that was held back would now have nowhere to go, so would add to the torrent in the road. So causing flood damage to more properties in surrounding houses and into the village centre.</p> <p>This has been a recurring issue twice since so is now more than 1 in 30 year occurrence.</p>	<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 will be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk assessment that takes all forms of flooding into account.</p>
42615681	Annex 1	We need these houses our children have to move away and all the reasons for not building are feeble	Comment noted
42594849	Annex 1	<p>Regarding development sites on Snoll Hatch and Addlestead 59613, 59876 and 59837.</p> <p>These sites are inappropriate for development due to the following:</p> <p>All roads to the sites flood. We have lived on Snoll Hatch Road for 11 years and have witnessed flooding in the village including Snoll Hatch Road and Addlestead Road. The sites are in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a character area. New build houses will severely affect the aesthetic of existing buildings and de-value these considerably. The site is green belt land. Snoll Hatch is a hamlet and must be kept separate from East Peckham. Building on this site goes against established anti-coalescence policy.</p> <p>There are already parking problems and the narrow roads are unsuitable for high traffic, heavy machinery and large equipment. There is poor accessibility. Snoll Hatch Road will not be able to stand the volume of traffic.</p> <p>The village has no GP surgery, limited public transport and no rail station nearby. The roads to the station flood and there is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42632609	Annex 1	<p>Site 59646</p> <p>This entire area is a flood plain providing essential drainage for a massive area. To build here would be absolute madness and a genuine threat to surrounding areas.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42632609	Annex 1	<p>Site 59646</p> <p>This site provides much needed access to nature for local residents. To build this close to the river would be detrimental to the lives of those who love in the area.</p> <p>Intensive agriculture has already reduced woodland in this area to a fraction of what it should be, building here would be devastating to local wildlife.</p> <p>These woods also host the endangered nightingale on its migration path. Any attempt to build here would certainly mean we never see these birds again.</p>	Comment noted.
42648289	Annex 1	<p>As with the majority of East Peckham residents, my concerns about the planned proposals include:</p> <p>The site(s) in question are in a flood zone. Vast areas of East Peckham regularly floods, removing more 'soakaway' land and replacing it with concrete will have a direct impact on existing residential dwellings creating even more flood areas than there are already.</p> <p>The river Bourne and a number of tributary streams run through the village. Increased building on and around these areas will impact flows and will potentially cause additional, chaotic and unprecedented flood risk - on top of the already high-flood risk that the village lives with.</p> <p>Many areas are not accessible by flood wardens, making loss of life during floods more likely.</p> <p>Final point is probably not even worth mentioning anymore, but this is designated 'green belt' land. Please consider all brown field sites before using this crucial green belt land for housing.</p>	Comments noted. These will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42649025	Annex 1	I am writing to oppose the proposed development of 2 plots of land in Hale Street ref 59782 and 59650 near to the Brookside Garden Centre end. Namely due to over population in area, flooding, GP facilities are not large enough and the school is not large enough.	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.
42661473	Annex 1	Site ref 59646. I cannot see how this land is an appropriate site for more housing/industrial units. It is an area that has flooded in the recent past resulting in many animals at the Hop Farm losing their lives. The immediate area and amenities already under pressure with two large developments at Foal Hurst Green and Mascalls	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
45373697	Annex 1	<p>SITE 59699 is grade 1 agricultural land and has been used as such for decades and should NOT be included in the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is a wide range of wildlife that inhabit the surrounding woodlands such as deer, bats, pheasants, and foxes.</p> <p>The site also slopes down towards the houses on Ewell Avenue so there would be a massive concern regarding flooding.</p> <p>You mention that there is a healthcare facility within 400m of this location which is not true....out healthcare provisions are already at breaking point since the closure of the surgery in West Malling High Street, causing us to have to drive to either Kings Hill (2.25km) or Leybourne (2.10km), where getting an appointment is like extremely difficult because of pressure caused by the number of patients that use the facilities.</p> <p>You also mention that there are bus stops and cycle paths. We have no cycle paths, and the nearest bus stop is either in the village which is 600m or Manor Park which is much further as there is no direct route to it.</p> <p>Access to the site would be via narrow country lanes which would cause increased traffic leading to a potential accident hotspot. There are big parts of Offham Road that do not have footpaths, the same with Fartherwell Road.</p> <p>This site has also had previous planning permission refused. There are a tree protection orders in place, in fact you refused a planning request just this year to 'top' the canapes of the scotch pines and oak trees!</p> <p>Also, this site was not submitted as part of the previous plan as it was not viable, so why has that changed! This site is also close to a conservation area and any development here would have a detrimental effect.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42705473	Annex 1	<p>Site 59696: fields at the rear of Vauxhall Gardens TN11 0LZ. The appraisal claims the site is within 800m of medical facilities. That may only be true as the crow flies, if it refers to Tonbridge Cottage Hospital, to the south, on the other side of the dual A21; the only viable pedestrian or vehicle route is much longer. The nearest doctors' surgery, Tonbridge Medical Centre is over a mile away. The appraisal says there is no watercourse, but there is seasonal flow down the ditch alongside the track leading to Priory Wood and a pond in the copse on the northern edge of the site. The appraisal does not mention that development would mean the loss of mature oaks and a copse with Tree Preservation Orders, as well as the loss of established hedgerows; the environmental impact would be significant. The site is Green Belt and looks across to the High Weald AONB on Castle Hill slopes. Access to the highway would only be possible via the hazardous Vauxhall Gardens junction to Pembury Road, which would entail skirting the listed Vauxhall pub. Air quality would be worsened by additional traffic entering a frequently congested road and Vauxhall roundabout. There are no schools with spare capacity within walking distance. The site is unsuitable for high density housing.</p> <p>Site 59697: this constricted, sloping, triangular site has been proposed for 'commercial' use. It is bounded by the embankment of the southbound A21 carriageway, the southbound off-ramp down to Vauxhall roundabout and the Vauxhall Lane connection loop from the northbound A21. There is no conceivable junction for vehicular access. The site has no existing access to power or sewerage. If developed with a warehouse or similar it would blight the southern gateway into Tonbridge. Like 59696 it is Green Belt and close to the road gates to the Grade 2 listed Somerhill Park.</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.
42380353	Annex 1	<p>* Comments on Annex 1</p> <p>The Green Belt is not a constraint that is screened for in this iteration of the assessment of sites. It should have been seen as a constraint that needed to be applied in order to indicate the amount land available for development outside the Green Belt. This should have been done to justify the need for 'exceptional circumstances. (There should also have been a Green Belt study to indicate the most vulnerable areas of the Green Belt in relation to its 5 functions as part of evidence base.)</p> <p>AONB should also have been screened out. There is much more land outside the AONB in the Borough than there is of land outside the Green Belt. There are therefore no exceptional circumstances that would justify releasing land from the AONB for development. No land should be allocated in the AONB.</p> <p>Comments on individual sites 59779, 59825 and 59827:</p> <p>Common to all three sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26- to A227 and cross country to the A21 * The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times and provides no better service than to the other two sites in terms of accessibility to the current school bus route. * All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the GB. * The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. * The pipes for providing water supply are inadequate for new development 	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>* Sewerage and land drainage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827.</p> <p>* Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary School, already oversubscribed.</p> <p>* 59827 has been identified in the Para 5.41 of the Sustainability Appraisal as being a least sustainable site option for allocation, the other 2 have not been so identified. All three should have been identified as 'a least sustainable site option for allocation'.</p> <p>Site 59779:</p> <p>* Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area.</p> <p>* Poor drainage on southern boundary.</p> <p>* Access onto Back Lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times.</p> <p>* Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227.</p> <p>* Bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service.</p> <p>* There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825:</p> <p>* Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area.</p> <p>* Very open site.</p> <p>* Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane.</p> <p>* Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>Site 59827:</p> <p>* Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area.</p> <p>* Open site</p> <p>* There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary.</p> <p>* There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.</p> <p>* Dangerous access onto Back Lane or narrow Reeds Lane and dangerous junctions at either end of Back Lane</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
45357665	Annex 1	<p>[59779]</p> <p>Site in Green Belt, proposed 38 houses, traffic, opposite primary school, with direct access to fast A227 main road.</p> <p>[59827]</p> <p>Site in Green Belt, proposed 82 house, traffic on narrow country lanes with no village shop, GP surgery or bus service.</p> <p>[59825]</p> <p>Site in Green Belt, backing on to cottage gardens and contributing to danger on country lanes with no speed limit.</p>	<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.</p>
42096289	Annex 1	<p>Site 59616</p> <p>As a local flood warden I very strongly object to development on this land. The site is flood zone 3, directly adjacent to the Medway and on its convergence with another watercourse. During flooding it is a very dangerous area for people to be. Loss of life is a very real prospect in this area as land both sides of the Medway becomes a raging torrent of deep floodwater.</p> <p>Further, the flooding from the village of East Peckham caused by the Medway further upstream drains away and re-enters the Medway at the direct location of site 59616. Any construction or ground raising upon this land would block the flow of escaping water and displace that floodwater back into the village to increase flooding of surrounding roads and properties. Medway Meadows would be especially at risk. A cul-de-sac of 32 houses, many of which already flood, and is located directly opposite site 59616</p> <p>The kind of lighting normally used for employment and industrial sites would be completely unsuitable on site 59616. It directly overlooks family homes and rear gardens and both light and noise pollution would significantly negatively affect many residents quality of life.</p> <p>There must be many more suitable sites for employment within the borough, rather than site 59616, which sits in arguably the most flood prone and dangerous location in the entire borough. Nearby properties and residents are trapped by the Medway to South and the East, Bourne to the West and Coult to the North and suffer the worst flooding in the Borough. Any development on this site would only worsen that flooding.</p>	<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.</p>
42096289	Annex 1	<p>Site 59646</p> <p>This site is almost entirely flood zone 3 and acts as a very important flood plain for East Peckham. Should this land be developed it would have severe consequences for the village as huge amounts of floodwater would be displaced into the village. Flooding is so severe in this area there is significant risk of loss of life. Both sides of the river burst their banks and surrounding areas become a raging torrent up to four feet deep. As a local flood warden I very much object to development upon site 59646. The footpaths and surrounding land on both sides of the Medway as it flows through East Peckham can be a very dangerous place to be.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Local Plan will take into consideration all forms of flooding in the Strategic Flood risk Assessment</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42714561	Annex 1	<p>Site 59761</p> <p>Objections to residential dwellings for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) the closest primary school to this site is currently oversubscribed and further development will impact on dwellings built on this site</p> <p>2) the doctors surgery located less than half a mile away currently cannot deal with demand & is crippled. Further development will be detrimental to an already poor health care service</p> <p>3) building more houses does not support climate change so this needs to be shown as a negative impact.</p> <p>4) The volume of traffic using the A228 is already beyond capacity - access for vehicles coming onto the A228 from Kate Reed Wood and the Airfield Estate are dangerous. Due to the volume it makes pulling out of these roads almost impossible in peak periods. Frustrated drivers then take risks and move into the middle of the carriageway which having witnessed on several occasions has caused near misses. Further development will only further increase traffic levels which will further increase the risk of accidents and danger to pedestrians. School children are currently at risk having to cross an extremely busy road with no traffic calming or crossing measures in place. An increase in traffic caused by further development will increase this risk.</p> <p>5) the proposed sites for redevelopment exceed the current level of housing that already exists in Kings Hill/West Malling - how can this current application be supported? The impact on climate change, the environment and human mental health & well being will be significantly impacted in a negative way if this site is developed.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42583393	Annex 1	<p>Site 59811</p> <p>the listed Historic parkland is not shown on the map for this site,</p> <p>the listed area will be reduced by over 60% of the land.</p> <p>Historic England list no; 1001355</p> <p>As mentioned in my email regarding this site :</p> <p>The roads surrounding it are mostly single track only passing another vehicle by going onto grass verge, impossible to pass tractors and trucks . Reversing around often blind bends to let them pass. Tractors with trailers cannot reverse.</p> <p>Hadlow has tiny primary school with no room to develop, a doctors surgery that cannot take any patients and no space to develop and much of the time you cannot get through the village as is gridlocked.</p> <p>No parking provision near shops and poor bus service to the towns.</p> <p>No secondary school, no train station.</p> <p>Very dangerous to cycle through the village.</p> <p>Site area has dreadful internet and phone service.</p> <p>No way to improve access to Hadlow Road without compulsory purchase of two private houses and the recent Travellers site at the road junction.</p> <p>Greensand Way runs though the site on the listed land.</p>	<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.</p>
42096289	Annex 1	<p>Site 59813</p> <p>This site is both green belt and grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>Access to this site is from Church Lane which suffers regular flooding. All other nearby lanes are very narrow and flood extensively leaving site 59813 isolated and inaccessible during flooding. As a local flood warden I strongly object to development of this land. Not only would any new community be at risk but existing properties, both nearby and downstream, would have increased flood risk due to development.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Flood risk will be considered as part of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42720769	Annex 1	<p>Re sites 59639, 59640 and 59753</p> <p>Bush Road is very narrow, prone to flooding, unlit, has no pavements and limited visibility due to the bends. There is already a dangerous level of traffic speeding along the road with 2 cars struggling to pass. Our own fence has been hit by cars a number times as well as the adjacent electricity transformer and gas main. The sites are prime agricultural land. Any additional homes will exacerbate an already dangerous situation.</p> <p>Re site 69813</p> <p>This is a huge development site on prime agricultural land / green belt and would overwhelm the existing limited infrastructure and facilities (eg no GP surgery). Church Lane is already a very busy road with a dangerous junction onto Bush Road. Flooding is an issue for the area</p>	<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.</p>
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Site 59525</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc).</p> <p>Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas.</p> <p>Water pressure problems.</p> <p>Water meter problems.</p> <p>Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight.</p> <p>Would destroy mature trees.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Site 59525</p> <p>This site should be designated a green space.</p> <p>Developing the site would be detrimental to health and well-being of the community.</p> <p>This site is regularly used by the community for singing groups, keep fit sessions, parades, Salvation Army events, football, children playing, a place to sit and be within nature, dog walking, a place to meet and socialise, a place for those with no gardens, a safe place to meet in an emergency, a place for the air ambulance to land (anything else you can think of)</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc).</p> <p>Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas.</p> <p>Water pressure problems.</p> <p>Water meter problems.</p> <p>Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight.</p> <p>Would destroy mature trees.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Site 59525</p> <p>This site should be designated a green space.</p> <p>Developing the site would be detrimental to health and well-being of the community.</p> <p>This site is regularly used by the community for singing groups, keep fit sessions, parades, Salvation Army events, football, children playing, a place to sit and be within nature, dog walking, a place to meet and socialise, a place for those with no gardens, a safe place to meet in an emergency, a place for the air ambulance to land (anything else you can think of)</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Roads to the site flood (Addlestead, Bullen corner, Tonbridge Rd, etc).</p> <p>Site is isolated from many village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Surface water run off will contribute to flooding downstream.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Site is near to and within sight of both Snoll Hatch and Bullen Corner Character Areas.</p> <p>Water pressure problems.</p> <p>Water meter problems.</p> <p>Would starve natural daylight from houses already struggling for daylight.</p> <p>Would destroy mature trees.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721217	Annex 1	<p>Site 59613</p> <p>mr Alex Barrett</p> <p>17 westwood road</p> <p>east peckham</p> <p>tn12 5de</p> <p>email alexbarrett26@gmail.com phone 07713256625</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p> <p>there is a large water drainage ditch which removes alot of water from the area which is not identified on this plan</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Site 59613</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Site 59616</p> <p>Site is in flood zone 3.</p> <p>Roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>This is the exact point where flooding in Pinkham, Old Rd, Hale St (south), Branbridges and Medway Meadows leaves the village and returns to the Medway River.</p> <p>Development of the site could significantly increase flooding locally.</p> <p>The location of this site is unsuitable for type of lighting associated with employment units.</p> <p>The site overlooks residential properties and rear gardens.</p> <p>The site has a main River, the Medway, directly on its boundary.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Anti coalescence policy, Branbridges estate must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Site 59616</p> <p>Site is in flood zone 3.</p> <p>Roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>This is the exact point where flooding in Pinkham, Old Rd, Hale St (south), Branbridges and Medway Meadows leaves the village and returns to the Medway River.</p> <p>Development of the site could significantly increase flooding locally.</p> <p>The location of this site is unsuitable for type of lighting associated with employment units.</p> <p>The site overlooks residential properties and rear gardens.</p> <p>The site has a main River, the Medway, directly on its boundary.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Anti coalescence policy, Branbridges estate must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721217	Annex 1	<p>Site 59646</p> <p>[redacted]</p> <p>The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land.</p> <p>The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village.</p> <p>Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstream.</p> <p>The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3.</p> <p>Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>During flooding their is significant risk of loss of life in this area.</p> <p>East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Site 59646</p> <p>The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land.</p> <p>The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village.</p> <p>Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstream.</p> <p>The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3.</p> <p>Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>During flooding their is significant risk of loss of life in this area.</p> <p>East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Site 59646</p> <p>The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land.</p> <p>The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village.</p> <p>Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occuring upstream.</p> <p>The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3.</p> <p>Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>During flooding their is significant risk of loss of life in this area.</p> <p>East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Site 59813</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site can be isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site could flood property downstream.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>The CLH fuel pipeline system runs through this site.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at the nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721217	Annex 1	<p>Site 59837 [Redacted]</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721217	Annex 1	<p>Site 59876</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Site 59876</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Site 69813</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site can be isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site could flood property downstream.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>The CLH fuel pipeline system runs through this site.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at the nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Site 69813</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site can be isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site could flood property downstream.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>The CLH fuel pipeline system runs through this site.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at the nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721057	Annex 1	<p>Site Number 59613 Should not be developed for the following reasons:</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement</p> <p>There is a large drainage ditch for water that runs all the way along the end of the gardens of Westwood Road, between Westwood and this proposed development area, this ditch fills up even with the field currently as a field. Houses on this land would lead to nowhere else for the flood water to go and properties could be flooded.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721057	Annex 1	<p>Site Number 59837 Should not be developed for the following reasons:</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement</p> <p>There is a large drainage ditch for water that runs all the way along the end of the gardens of Westwood Road, between Westwood and this proposed development area, this ditch fills up even with the field currently as a field. Houses on this land would lead to nowhere else for the flood water to go and properties could be flooded.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721057	Annex 1	<p>Site Number 59876 Should not be developed for the following reasons:</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement</p> <p>There is a large drainage ditch for water that runs all the way along the end of the gardens of Westwood Road, between Westwood and this proposed development area, this ditch fills up even with the field currently as a field. Houses on this land would lead to nowhere else for the flood water to go and properties could be flooded.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59613, 59876 and 59837</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59639, 59640 and 59753</p> <p>Very narrow lanes in the area.</p> <p>Two vehicles often struggle to pass each other.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zone 1.</p> <p>Bush Rd floods.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Bush Rd is unlit with no pavements.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways may be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Anti coalescence , the Hamlet of Peckham Bush must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is an animal sanctuary very close by.</p> <p>There is an ancient pilgrimage trail passing through.</p> <p>There are many heritage assets within 250 metres.</p> <p>Site is grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>The proposed new town on the A26 will cause further flooding to watercourses in the area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59639, 59640 and 59753</p> <p>Very narrow lanes in the area.</p> <p>Two vehicles often struggle to pass each other.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zone 1.</p> <p>Bush Rd floods.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Bush Rd is unlit with no pavements.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways may be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Anti coalescence , the Hamlet of Peckham Bush must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is an animal sanctuary very close by.</p> <p>There is an ancient pilgrimage trail passing through.</p> <p>There are many heritage assets within 250 metres.</p> <p>Site is grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>The proposed new town on the A26 will cause further flooding to watercourses in the area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59747, 59806 and 59846</p> <p>Very narrow lanes between East Peckham and the sites.</p> <p>Two vehicles often struggle pass pass each other.</p> <p>Many roads to the site flood.</p> <p>The A26 floods</p> <p>Sites fall into flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Sites include grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>The sites are in the catchment area for the Coult Stream and Boroughs Oak Stream, both of which already regularly flood parts of East Peckham.</p> <p>Any surface water discharge from these sites will increase flood risk in East Peckham.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Site 59806 completely overwhelms two important heritage assets. If site 59806 is developed, no development should happen east of the A228 (Seven Mile Lane) to protect these assets.</p> <p>Views both of and from St Michaels Church will be ruined.</p> <p>If site 59806 is developed, a strong boundary of green belt must be maintained between it and Peckham Bush.</p> <p>An ancient pilgrimage trail runs through the sites.</p> <p>There is no rail station within 3 miles.</p> <p>Roads to the nearest two stations flood.</p> <p>There is no parking at Beltring station.</p> <p>The Parish of East Peckham has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59747, 59806 and 59846</p> <p>Very narrow lanes between East Peckham and the sites.</p> <p>Two vehicles often struggle pass pass each other.</p> <p>Many roads to the site flood.</p> <p>The A26 floods</p> <p>Sites fall into flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Sites include grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>The sites are in the catchment area for the Coult Stream and Boroughs Oak Stream, both of which already regularly flood parts of East Peckham.</p> <p>Any surface water discharge from these sites will increase flood risk in East Peckham.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Site 59806 completely overwhelms two important heritage assets. If site 59806 is developed, no development should happen east of the A228 (Seven Mile Lane) to protect these assets.</p> <p>Views both of and from St Michaels Church will be ruined.</p> <p>If site 59806 is developed, a strong boundary of green belt must be maintained between it and Peckham Bush.</p> <p>An ancient pilgrimage trail runs through the sites.</p> <p>There is no rail station within 3 miles.</p> <p>Roads to the nearest two stations flood.</p> <p>There is no parking at Beltring station.</p> <p>The Parish of East Peckham has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The Local Plan will be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Heritage Strategy.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59789 and 59682</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>A main river, the Coult Stream, runs through the site and regularly floods.</p> <p>Any surface water discharge from these sites will flood property downstream.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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. Flood risk will be considered via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59789 and 59682</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>A main river, the Coult Stream, runs through the site and regularly floods.</p> <p>Any surface water discharge from these sites will flood property downstream.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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. Flood risk will be considered via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59837</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Parking problems.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site will cause flooding downstream and of surrounding property.</p> <p>High ground water levels and the use of soakaways unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a Character Area.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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. Flood risk will be considered via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59855, 59650 and 5978</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Roads between the village and the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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. Flood risk will be considered via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723265	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59855, 59650 and 59782</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Roads between the village and the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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. Flood risk will be considered via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723041	Annex 1	<p>Sites 59855, 59650 and 59872</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Roads between the village and the site flood.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>Surface water discharge into surrounding watercourses can cause flooding downstream.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>Sites 59855 and 59782 contain the CLH pipeline system.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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. Flood risk will be considered via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721057	Annex 1	<p>The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land.</p> <p>When we moved into the village in the year 2000 the whole village flooded just before Christmas. The flood water came from the Hop Farm and flowed down Pinkham then along the main road. Then, the water also flowed from Branbridges and back along the main road to join up with the water from Pinkham. People were trapped in the Crown Acres Estate and couldn't get out for three days!.</p> <p>The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village.</p> <p>Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occuring upstream.</p> <p>The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3.</p> <p>Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>During flooding their is significant risk of loss of life in this area.</p> <p>East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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. Flood risk will be considered via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42716609	Annex 1	<p>The sites located in Leybourne are all small green spaces used for recreational purposes, exercise and dog walking. These are all vitally important to the community and if they were to be built on then the area would have very little appeal to residents. Leybourne is already very well developed and the green spaces proposed to be developed are widely used. Specifically sites 59456, 59432, 59441, and 59445 all are heavily depended upon green spaces for the residents and are part of what makes Leybourne a great village to live in. Residents of leybourne strongly object to any development within our village.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42745313	Annex 1	<p>* Ref 59742 East Peckham</p> <p>I am very concerned regarding the proposal to build on this green belt land which is rich in wildlife and birds such as egrets. Additionally it floods as it is in flood zones 2 and 3. This causes flooded roads and properties downstream. Misery and distress for many residents, some of them elderly who have lived in the village for many years. In fact EP floods in several areas including the village centre as well as Hale Street and this will impact further. Why is this even being considered when green spaces are so essential to mental wellbeing and to our wildlife. We have no doctors surgery, no infrastructure to support all these proposed residents, we are a rural settlement being bombarded by planning applications. Look at brownfield sites and all the unoccupied properties for development across the south east and leave EPs green sites alone.</p>	<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. Flood risk will be considered via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
38927393	Annex 1	<p>I am responding on behalf of Plaxtol Parish Council. We have looked at the sites put forward in Plaxtol parish and also ones bordering our parish or nearby ones which will have an impact on the primary school, medical centres in Borough Green, Hadlow and Tonbridge and the roads. These include ID nos: 59774, 59778, 59862, 59830, 59709, 59720, 59677, 59773, 59877, 59767, 59748, 59608, 59811, 59776, 59842, 50608, 59770, 59779, 59827 and 59825. For all these proposed sites we cannot definitively agree or disagree with the Borough Council's comments because there are no details of the infrastructure that would persuade us and our parishioners to accept the proposals. By this I mean no detail on how the roads will cope with the extra traffic; what provision for schools (both primary and secondary) have been built in for the increase in school children and students; what plans have been discussed for existing medical centres to manage the increase in patients or for new centres to be built; and barely any mention of climate change and environmental impact on each of the sites and how the Council intends to mitigate these?</p>	<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.</p>
42744417	Annex 1	<p>I am writing to express my total opposition to your plans to build on green infill areas around Leybourne including the 'bomb hole', the donkey field, the field alongside Castle Way where the children's play ground and the dog exercise area on Lillieburn.</p> <p>We have far too much development in our area and following your unilateral decision (clearly not taking any notice whatsoever of the many letters of opposition from all round the area) to build on the 40 acre field there is no green space from Maidstone through to Leybourne now!</p> <p>You take no responsibility for the implications of increased traffic movements this and subsequent developments will bring to the roads especially the A20. If you took just a few minutes away from your office at rush hour/school times you will see that it is plainly obvious that the existing infrastructure is insufficient now!</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst you insist on the developers providing doctors surgeries etc. these are left empty as recruitment is impossible in the South East, look at the recent example at Leybourne Chase. Surely the planning officer can not be that short sighted not to understand the dire situation relating to Kingshill surgery where appointments are non existent and patient satisfaction is on the floor.</p> <p>To build even more housing on infill sites is short sighted at best and totally irresponsible at worst.</p> <p>I would like to think that my comments will be reviewed along with every other objection although I suspect that they will be binned along with everyone else who has expressed disapproval.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42744929	Annex 1	I would like to object to the plans to build on site ref. 59884 adjacent to Tower View and Maypole Drive. This is a really nice space for families - one of the only Green spaces remaining. Children play games on the green and it is a really lovely environment for local families walking their dogs and playing games with their children. It is a beautiful outlook. The planting displays encourage bees and other insects to pollenate the plants. Additionally the Kings Hill medical practice is already full to capacity. It is already difficult to get an appointment! I urge you not to build here. It would be a great shame.	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.
42746017	Annex 1	ID59447 this is a car park which is critical to the local people and businesses of the village. Parking is under severe pressure at present	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	map 59619 This is an area of outstanding beauty and pristine wildlife area on greenbelt land. This area is adjacent to Maceys Meadow which is owned by the parish and serves as an ecological and wildlife area. Building houses next to Maceys meadow would be a detrimental act against the community and expand the limits of the village into green belt - also this is more than typical walking distance people are willing to make to get to the shops. Really poor accessibility	Comment noted
42746017	Annex 1	map ID 59488 this is a car park which is critical to the local people and businesses of the village. Parking is under severe pressure at present	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	map ID 59602 this area is of outstanding beauty and would effect views of St Leonard's Tower. It is far from local shops and services meaning people would need to drive everywhere	Comment noted.
42729569	Annex 1	Site 59071 I forgot to include in my original comments on this site the fact that it is Green Belt land. The NPPF states that green Belt land "serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." This site fails EVERY SINGLE ONE of those purposes. It (a) would perpetuate the sprawl of Tonbridge; (b) would move Tonbridge towards Five Oak Green and TWBC's proposed new town at Tudeley; (c) remove the safeguarding of the countryside; (d) destroy the setting and special character of the historic hamlet at Postern Lane; and (e) would not assist in urban regeneration since it is neither derelict nor urban land.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42590337	Annex 1	<p>Site 59646</p> <p>Hop Farm, East Peckham</p> <p>On the west side of this site is old quarry workings. ? Quick sand?</p> <p>Not able to build on this?</p> <p>More importantly it is an area where lots of Nightingales congregate each spring to gather, sing and breed. These birds are under threat and their habitats are ever decreasing.</p> <p>Housing nearby, even if the area they use is left will put them under threat due to the proximity of people, pets- cats and dogs. They nest near the ground so are especially vulnerable.</p>	Comments noted.
42740033	Annex 1	<p>site 59646, Hop Farm land, massive site all along the Medway from Branbridges to past Oak Weir Lock.</p> <p>The proposed site of 59646 acts a flood plain that helps protect the village of East Peckham. The Medway River is along its entire northern border and development upon it could cause serious flooding consequences for the village by displacing flood water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Rd, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would especially suffer from increased flood risk caused by developing this land.</p> <p>The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site, both major sources of flooding within the village.</p> <p>Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occuring upstream.</p> <p>The site is almost entirely within flood zone 3.</p> <p>Site is completely isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>During flooding their is significant risk of loss of life in this area.</p> <p>East Peckham Flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Anti coalescence policy, the Hamlet of Beltring must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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. As part of the development strategy, all forms of flood risk will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42469729	Annex 1	<p>Site 59742 Behind Brookside is not a suitable site for the following reasons</p> <p>Green belt land.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Site is isolated from village and it's services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels mean the use of soakaways could be unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>A stream (I think called Boroughs Oak Stream) runs directly through this land and regularly floods roads and properties downstream on Hale St and beyond.</p> <p>Any surface water discharge into this stream will increase likelihood of flooding.</p> <p>Should the new settlement on the A26 be built this stream will likely flood significantly more often.</p> <p>Egrets can be spotted here.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42590881	Annex 1	<p>Site 59813 (Bush Road and North of Church Lane)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Unsuitable for development. * Very narrow lanes in area * Poor accessibility * Site is in flood zones 2 and 3. * Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. * Sites are on greenbelt land. * High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. * Surface water discharge from 59813 in particular could flood property downstream. * Building on 59813 goes against anti coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham. * The CLH fuel pipeline goes through site 59813. * No rail station close by or walkable. * No parking at the nearest station. * No lighting or pavement on road to station. * The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery. * The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. <p>Sites 59639, 59640, 59753 (Bush Road)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Unsuitable for development. * Very narrow lanes in area * Poor accessibility * Sites are in flood zone 1. * Bush Road and roads to the site flood. * Bush road unlit with no pavements * Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. * High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. * Anti coalescence, the hamlet of Peckham Bush should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham. * Animal sanctuary on Bush Road close to the development * Sites are on greenbelt land. * There is an ancient pilgrimage trail passing through * The proposed new town on the A26 will cause further flooding to watercourse in the area * No rail station close by or walkable. * No parking at the nearest station * No lighting or pavement on road to station. * The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery * The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. <p>Sites 59789, 59682 (Church Lane - South towards East Peckham)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Unsuitable for development. * Narrow lanes * Poor accessibility, sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. * Roads to the site flood. * A main river, Coult Stream, runs through the site and floods 	<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. As part of the development strategy, all forms of flood risk will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Any surface water discharge from these sites will flood property downstream * Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. * High ground water means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. * Sites are on greenbelt land. * Building goes against anti-coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham. * No rail station close by or walkable. * No parking at the nearest station. * No lighting or pavement on road to station. * The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery. * The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. <p>Site 59782 (Hale Street towards Bush Road)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Unsuitable for development. * Narrow lanes * Poor accessibility, sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. * Roads to the site flood. * A main river, Coult Stream, runs through the site and floods * Any surface water discharge from these sites will flood property downstream * Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. * The CLH fuel pipeline goes through site. * High ground water means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. * Sites are on greenbelt land. * Building goes against anti-coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham. <p>Sites 59742 (North of Brookside) Garden Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Unsuitable for development. * Poor accessibility, sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. * Roads to the site flood. * Sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding. * High ground water means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. * Sites are on greenbelt land. * No rail station close by or walkable. * No parking at the nearest station. * No lighting or pavement on road to station. * The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery. * The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. <p>Sites 59747, 59806, 59846 (Peckham Bush to Hadlow & Mereworth)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sites include grade 1 and 2 agricultural land * Unsuitable for development. * Poor accessibility, sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. * Roads to the site flood. 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sites are green belt land * Sites are in the catchment area for the count stream and Boroughs Oak stream both of which regularly flood East Peckham * Surface water discharge from sites will increase flood risk in East Peckham * Site 59806 completely overwhelms two important heritage assets (St Michael's church and Roydon Hall). If development happens for this site it should be East of the A228 to protect these assets. * Views both of and from St Michael's church will be ruined * An ancient pilgrimage trail runs through these sites * If 59806 is developed a strong boundary of green belt should be painted between it and Peckham Bush * No rail station close by or walkable. * No parking at the nearest station. * No lighting or pavement on road to station. * The roads to the station flood. the village has no GP surgery. * The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. <p>Site 59646 (Hop Farm)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Unsuitable for development. * Site acts as a flood plain protection for East Peckham village * The Medway river is along the entire northern border and development on this land could create serious flooding in East Peckham by displacing water back into the village * The River Bourne meets the River Medway at this site both major sources of flooding within the village * Alder Stream runs through this site and will already be accepting increased flow rates from mass development occurring upstream * Site is almost entirely within flood zone 3 * Site is completely cut off from village services in times of flooding * East Peckham flood wardens cannot reach this site in times of flooding without risking life * Sites are green belt land * High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsustainable for this area. * Anti coalescence policy, the hamlet of Belting must be kept separate from East Peckham * No parking at the nearest station. * No lighting or pavement on road to station. * The roads to the station flood. * The village has no GP surgery. * The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement. 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42740033	Annex 1	<p>Site 59813</p> <p>Narrow lanes.</p> <p>Poor accessibility.</p> <p>Site is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>All roads to the site flood.</p> <p>Site can be isolated from village services during times of flooding.</p> <p>High ground water levels means the use of soakaways is likely unsuitable for this area.</p> <p>Site is Green belt land.</p> <p>Surface water discharge from this site could flood property downstream.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established anti coalescence policy and the Hamlet of Hale St must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>The CLH fuel pipeline system runs through this site.</p> <p>There is no rail station close by.</p> <p>There is no parking at the nearest station.</p> <p>There is no lighting or pavement on the road to the station.</p> <p>The roads to the station flood.</p> <p>The village has no GP Surgery.</p> <p>The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42590337	Annex 1	<p>Site 59876</p> <p>Strettit Farm</p> <p>This site is on the opposite side of the road to sites 59837 and 59613.</p> <p>Same issues potentially apply.</p> <p>Bad, restricted view access near a bend on a narrow road.</p> <p>This site is also higher than the road and holds back water when there is flooding or high water. If the field was used for building on- acknowledging there are already farm/other buildings in existence then this water at present held back would cause flooding and damage to more properties in the village and down into the village centre.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flood risk will to taken into account in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42740897	Annex 1	<p>Site ID 13098644</p> <p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 59685 * 59690 * 59693 * 59721 * 59805 * 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. * They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A). The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. * The importance of domestic food production has been highlighted by the recent food shortages cause by the war in Ukraine. * Local food production is made more important by the effects of climate change. * They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. * Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. * Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. * Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. * Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>* There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>* These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>Dealing with each site in turn:</p>	
42744641	Annex 1	<p>SITE IDS: 59813, 59639, 59640, 59753 and 59782 All the above sites are unsuitable for development due to i) very poor accessibility; ii) sites in flood zones 2 and 3; iii) roads to the sites flood; iv) sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding; v) high ground water means the use of soak aways is unlikely to be suitable/sustainable for this area; vi) sites on greenbelt land; vii) surface water discharge from 59813 in particular could flood property downstream; viii) building on site 59813 contradicts anti-coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham; ix) CLH fuel pipeline goes through 59813; x) no railway station close by; xi) closest railway station is not a mainline station, has no parking and has no direct routes to London; xii) closest railway station has no lighting or pavement on the roads leading to it and the roads flood; xiii) there is no GP surgery in the village (the NHS refused to continue funding it so it closed down) Yalding or Paddock Wood are the closest GP surgeries. The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a Rural Service Centre to a Rural Settlement.</p>	<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.</p>
42727329	Annex 1	<p>We would like to register our objection to the following sites: 59701 (10.79 ha), 9661 (7.11 ha), 59834 (63.39 ha).</p> <p>Your own reports highlight the significant challenges in delivering these sites due to flood risk, impact to environment, detriment to green belt, and proximity to historical assets, all of which we agree with, and make it clear that these are simply not viable options.</p> <p>In addition; one element that the reports don't accurately reflect is the non reversible damage that would be done to one of Tonbridge's key assets which is Postern Lane and the public footpath that runs along it.</p> <p>As a lane resident we observe the large number of local Tonbridge residents that use this footpath through out the week, enjoying access to the open countryside that is right on Tonbridge's doorstep, stopping and taking in the number of historical houses that sit on the road.</p> <p>Developing the above sites would irrevocably damage the character of this area, and materially impact the enjoyment and value so many of Tonbridge's wider residents take from this walk. We respect the need for development and growth, but if the recent pandemic and lockdowns have taught us anything, it should be to respect and cherish our local areas that bring so much mental well being to so many, and not spoil them forever more with industrial buildings.</p> <p>It would a sad day if decisions were made to prioritise putting a discount carpet warehouse or car garage in direct line of site of some of Tonbridge's most significant historical assets that have stood for 3-400years.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42617505	Annex 1	<p>Site ID 59740</p> <p>Well you cannot be serious!</p> <p>This would decimate this entire area and add to the misery of residents living with the dreadful Ditton Edge Disaster.</p> <p>For so many reasons. Including.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A beautiful area that you will ruin. 2. Enjoyed by countless cyclists and walkers. 3. Will remove a very large area of grade A agricultural land. 4. Will remove a very large area of green space that separates West and East Malling from Kings Hill. 5. It has a roads infrastructure worse than what is about to descend on us all from Ditton Edge..... <p>I could go on and on here....this site cannot in all honesty be being considered as a development site can it?</p> <p>And finally---have you noticed that you are putting virtually ALL development in the north of the borough?</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42720097	Annex 1	<p>LX Site 59424 Residential 164 dwellings woods end of Clearheart Lane</p> <p>This development is rear of Redwell Grove, Bancroft Lane, Hollandbury Park, Cellini Walk, Alderwick Grove, Quindell Place, Clearheart Lane, McArthur Drive, Victory Drive.</p> <p>Reasons for objections - DEFRA Forest Inventory, Ancient Woodland and TO protected trees, over development with inadequate resources on Kings Hill, harm to protected species, outside of,</p> <p>This development surrounds Tower View, Melrose Avenue Braeburn Way, Alfriston Grove, Boverde Avenue</p> <p>Reasons for objections - change of character of the area, traffic impact to and from Kings Hill centre, loss of public open space.</p> <p>LX] Site 59534 Residential 18 dwellings Tower View Green North West</p> <p>This development surrounds Tower View, Woodford Grove, Cardinal Walk, Baxter Way, Hazen Road, Kendall Avenue</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre, loss of public space.</p> <p>[X] Site 59544 Conservation Area off Bancroft Lane Residential 5 dwellings</p> <p>This development adjoins Bancroft Lane, Cellini Walk and rear of Redwell Grove</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservation areas, harm to non-listed Heritage assets, preservation order.</p> <p>L)Xi Site 59547 Residential 6 dwellings Discovery Drive Next to Conservation Area</p> <p>This development adjoins Discovery Drive, Rougemont and Avion Gardens</p> <p>Reasons for objections - loss of open Green space, harm to conservation areas and harm to significant of conservation areas.</p> <p>1X1 59630 Fields North of Amber Lane mixed use 157 dwellings</p> <p>This development is rear of Shoemith Lane, Amber Lane, Sandow Place</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Proposed Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams,</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>outside of the confines of existing developments, traffic restricted on local roads, visual impact from Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Ancient Woodland</p> <p>[X] Site 59631 Wateringbury Road Heath Farm next to Sports Park 136 dwellings</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Existing public Open Space for Kings Hill\ Countryside, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted on local roads.</p> <p>[X1 Site 59634 Hoath Wood Ancient Woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal</p> <p>Residential 104 dwellings Adjoins Lavender Road, Rear of Glenton Avenue, Keepsake Drive,</p> <p>Reasons for objections-harm to conservation area and harm to significance or conservation areas, Ancient woodland and Tree Preservation Orders, countryside, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted on local roads, visual impact from AONB.</p> <p>[X1 Site 59655 Road to North Pole behind Victory Drive Residential 143 dwellings</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Green belt, Countryside, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted on local roads.</p> <p>1 Site 59740 Broadwater Farm mixed use estimate 3000 dwellings</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservation areas, proposed Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted on local roads, inadequate resources -</p> <p>KCC indicated suggested school location not economic, no retail centre.</p> <p>Severe Impact on</p> <p>bio-diversity</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Surrounds Mitchell Road, Kate Reed Wood, Lapins Lane, Russet Way, Lambourne Drive, Meteor Road A228</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Ancient woodland (part of site), Green Belt, countryside, access issues to local roads.</p> <p>****59752/59762 South of Lapins Lane (Phase 1) to A26 - details awaited</p> <p>LX site 59797 West Quarter of Kings Hill Golf Course to A26 Residential 1228 dwellings</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservation areas, Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams, harm to quiet lane and rural road</p> <p>Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted on local roads.</p> <p>X1 site 59802 Residential 644 dwellings East f Canon Lane South of Hollandbury Park</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Green Belt, countryside, harm to the aquifer for streams, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of existing developments./ifs* o Lagniquistrateg; trattic onstasted on local roads, and severe inpast capariM</p> <p>[X1 Site 59884 Tower Green area (North East) Residential 21 dwellings</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre, loss of public open space</p> <p>i*] I object to Kings Hill being classified as an urban settlement (Q.2 Local plan question) as it does not have the facilities to support its status - it does not have the facilities that would be required to support the additional population that would be added as a result of its classification.</p> <p>over soom to the train stahon therefere car have would increase,</p> <p>[X] 1 support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West</p> <p>Mailing to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59598</p> <p>Seven Mile Lane is already a notorious death trap, even though it hasn't yet managed to claim the 3 lives you seek. Further development on this road would no doubt accelerate the achievement of that milestone.</p>	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59599</p> <p>Seven Mile Lane is already a notorious death trap, even though it hasn't yet managed to claim the 3 lives you seek. Further development on this road would no doubt accelerate the achievement of that milestone.</p>	Comment noted.
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59750</p> <p>Mereworth's built environment is almost entirely to the north of The Street. This green field site is to the south and borders the historic listed church. Development here would entirely change the nature of the village.</p>	Comment noted
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59752</p> <p>The A228 at this point is already a notorious death trap, even though it hasn't yet managed to claim the 3 lives you seek. Further development on this road would no doubt accelerate the achievement of that milestone.</p>	Comment noted
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59757</p> <p>Beech Road is a single-track lane that is used as a rat run between Seven Mile Lane and the A228, making it unsafe to walk along. New Pound Lane is similar and could not accommodate the additional traffic that development of this site would generate.</p>	Comment noted
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59758</p> <p>Beech Road is a single-track lane that is used as a rat run between Seven Mile Lane and the A228, making it unsafe to walk along. To put further housing here would exacerbate an already intractable problem.</p>	Comment noted
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59759</p> <p>At Kent Street the A228 is exceptionally narrow for a major north-south artery and has been the subject of multiple proposals over the years to make it safer. Beech Road is a single-track lane that is used as a rat run between Seven Mile Lane and the A228, making it unsafe to walk along. To put further housing here would exacerbate an already intractable problem.</p>	Comment noted
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59760</p> <p>At Kent Street the A228 is exceptionally narrow for a major north-south artery and has been the subject of multiple proposals over the years to make it safer. To put further housing here would exacerbate an already intractable problem.</p>	Comment noted
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59761</p> <p>At Kent Street the A228 is exceptionally narrow for a major north-south artery and has been the subject of multiple proposals over the years to make it safer. To put further housing here would exacerbate an already intractable problem.</p>	Comment noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42757153	Annex 1	<p>59816</p> <p>The Street has already been spoiled by back-filling in Torrington Close and Church Close. To do similarly here, adjacent to the primary school, would compound the traffic congestion that blights the village twice a day.</p>	Comment noted
42720801	Annex 1	<p>I do not agree to the following sites 59842, 59686, 59637 and 59638 being used for housing. The village of Hadlow does not have the infrastructure to support the increase in housing. Also, by increasing the housing, the main road A26 is already congested with traffic and adding further housing will only add to this congestion.</p> <p>These sites are also green belt. Hadlow has wonderful walks which would be lost if housing were to be built. Not only would it change the vistas and views of Hadlow, but it would impact the environment. The plots in particular provide a collection for ground water both from the surrounding fields, which have flooded in the past and goes against your 'Objective 8. Protect and advance quality of water features'. The function of these sites and utility is also of importance.</p> <p>It feels as if someone looked on Google, saw a village, a few plots of land and said why not build there to accommodate the pressure from government to build more housing. Protect the environment, don't destroy it!</p>	Comment noted
42747073	Annex 1	<p>I wish to comment on site 59811 [Page 696]. This is a huge area of green belt land and long established productive dairy and arable farm land. It is totally unsuitable for housing development - the rural road infrastructure cannot cope with existing traffic, there are serious issue of water drainage and management and this area is used as a significant rural recreation space for Hadlow residents many of whom use the public footpath which goes up to Oxenhoath. It is also at some considerable distance from shops, the health centre and schools. There is no bus route so there would be a huge increase in motor traffic just to get into Hadlow over small rural roads. And surely green belt is there for a purpose: to protect the countryside. This site is completely outside the village envelope for possible permitted development. I also note it is not included on 'Urban Capacity Study' by Urban Intelligence nor on the T&MBC SLA Final Assessments Document for Hadlow: the reason for this discrepancy it totally unclear. But Site 59811 seems to fail on all these criteria of assessment for suitability for development. I would also add that the map in Annex 1 is of very poor quality and appears to contain a number of errors.</p> <p>[Redacted]</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.
42765409	Annex 1	<p>ID number 59613</p> <p>This land is partially owned by my wife and myself and ideally located for housing development in the middle of the village of East Peckham. The interested developers are aware that there has to be an area of open land separating Snoll Hatch from East Peckham. Our land is of low flood risk, we have been here nearly 40 years and at no time has our land flooded. The design would ideally be mainly starter homes to enable the younger community to buy homes in their own village, something that is not possible at the moment. This would enable our school to continue as without these smaller starter homes, we are in danger of becoming a retirement village with no future.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42765409	Annex 1	<p>ID. Number 59837</p> <p>This land is owned by my wife and myself and is ideal as a smaller development if the alternative site -ID.59613, which includes this land is considered too large. It is ideally placed in the centre of East Peckham, is not high flood risk and importantly, could be developed without joining East Peckham to Snoll Hatch.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42771393	Annex 1	<p>My comments relate to sites 59682, 59782 and 59813.</p> <p>the hamlet of Hale Street has no doctors, no shopping facilities, no dentist, and no isupporting nrastructure.. currently with the recent closure of the local doctors the closest doctors is at Paddock Wood. The drs at Paddock wood already can't cope with the increased dwellings being built there and as such the next appointment can be as much as 28 says away.</p> <p>The sites proposed all sit higher than the existing surrounding properties in the area which are already in a flood zone.</p> <p>Each site sits alongside very narrow lane with poor accessibility, the already have parking problems and all road in the area already have flooding problems.</p> <p>These sites are isolated from the village when the roads flood.</p> <p>These sites are all valuable green belt with rare natural species, egrets, buzzards, and newts where the land runs alongside the streams.</p> <p>If the sites were to be deemed suitable then surface water discharge from these sites will cause significant flooding downstream .</p> <p>High ground water and the use of soakaways will be unsuitable in this area so the water must be directly discharged somewhere which will end up putting additional pressure on already stretched rivers/streams.</p> <p>Building oil these sites will also go directly against the TMBC established Coalescence statement where it is noted that hamlet of Hale Street must remain separate from East Peckham. building on these sites will be in-filing between East Peckham and Hale Street</p> <p>There are no direct services in Hale Street , so should be downgraded to Rural area from a rural settlement. (East Peckham Village should be Downgraded from a Rural Service Centre to a rural settlement</p> <p>Sites 59782 ans 59813 with have a large gas pipe under the hedge so development will be hazardous</p> <p>Site 59813 sits alongside Holy trinity church. this historic church current sits in rural surroundings and should be kept as such.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42436577	Annex 1	<p>Site 59489: This site is a small green space surrounded by housing. Crow Hill is already too narrow for large vehicles to access the houses and the site is overlooked by the surrounding houses, so any house built on this site would have no privacy. The public green space is important to all the residents of Crow Hill and I consider that it is unsuitable for any type of development.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42436577	Annex 1	site 59493: This is the car park for a well used railway station. The car park can be full on occasions so there is little scope to develop even part of the site. While it would be possible to create a multi-storey car park, this would not be in keeping with a village location.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42752577	Annex 1	<p>Site 59623 on the corner of Yardley Park Road and Shipbourne road is completely unsuitable for development. It has been rejected by the planning process already on the basis of its in appropriateness. This is not only due to the fact that it is placed in a conservation area as well as breaching covenants that exist on the road, but more importantly owing to the significant, impractical and dangerous impact the proposed access for the proposed development would have. The roundabout directly next to which the site is located is already extremely busy and the shipbourne road to the south of the roundabout (from which access would be required) is a significant bottle neck owing to its narrow width and the already busy traffic. In addition the one stop convenience store (which is a valued and much used shop in the area) is directly adjacent to the site and the lorries that supply the store need to park on the street directly where the new proposed access would be, which just will not work and make the traffic even worse. Most significant is that there are a number of schools in the immediate area with many children going to and from school at the beginning and end of the school day which adds to the already congested area, this development will make that even worse.</p> <p>In short, the proposed development is neither in keeping with the area nor will it alleviate in a significant way the housing needs of TMBC, but it will very materially have a detrimental impact on the accesbility of Tonbridge and add to what is already a significant traffic problem.</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.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59632: This site was considered by the planning inspectorate as part of an appeal linked to the new school and new Memorial Hall, both of which have now been constructed. The decision of the inspectorate was that there was no justification for removing this site from the MGB and that housing could not be permitted on this site.	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59717: this is known as the Glebe Lands and is opposite the site of the old Platt Primary School which has now been demolished. The site has a steep bank up from road level, which makes access to the site difficult and on the north side lies a railway line. Because of the dip in the A25 road on the approach to the site from the west, any site access could be hazardous as it is very difficult to see traffic beyond the brow.	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59724: This site is most peculiar as it is a very steep bank rising from a steep and narrow lane. The site looks too narrow to fit any construction onto it and there can be no space to park a car on the road as it is effectively single track along that length of the lane. I cannot see any realistic site of providing any accommodation other than a rabbit warren with direct access off the road.	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	Site 59737: it is not clear why only the area closest to the road has been offered for development as Ingleborough Farm extends much further up the hill. As for the Glebe Lands site further to the west, sight lines on the A25 make exiting the site difficult, although the lane has been used for many years to access the farm.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42773409	Annex 1	<p>Site 59811</p> <p>A large proportion of this site is classified as Grade II* listed Park and Garden. This is highlighted in List Entry No 1001355 of the Historic England List. Within the Parkland there are many ancient and veteran trees that must have Tree Protection Orders on them. If not, then they certainly should have. This historic site is formed mainly from the land that was owned and managed by the Oxen Hoath Estate for hundreds of years. It now acts as grazing land for cattle for a large local farm and is home to a diverse range of rare British wildlife including Buzzards, Kestrels, Owls, Deer and Stoats.</p> <p>Furthermore, the road networks on all sides of this site are narrow country roads with limited if any opportunity for widening. As such it's clear that this site should be rejected.</p>	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	<p>Site 59822: This site is sandwiched between the J Clubb sand pit and the Platt Industrial Estate, with access possible from either side. It is not clear who owns this land and whether it has already been given permission for mineral extraction. I understand that Kent CC will oppose any planning applications that diminish access to minerals and this might be an issue on this site.</p>	Comment noted.
42436577	Annex 1	<p>Site 59829: This site is a small area of woodland which does not have direct access to a public road. It appears to be part of the land known as Borough Green Sand Pits and it is not clear whether it is in the same ownership. It would require another means of access to be brought into use, this would most likely be via the sand pits and so it should be discounted as a developable site until access can be provided.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42436577	Annex 1	<p>Site 59830: This vast area is owned by mineral extraction companies who are bound by their planning agreements to restore the land as green belt after the cessation of mineral extraction. Some of the pits have already been backfilled, but at least one contains deleterious material and this was pointed out in the comments made on the previous (and now withdrawn) draft local plan. As the site extends to 130 acres and will affect a much wider area should development be permitted, it would be much better to consider it as a number of smaller parcels of land, some of which might be suitable for different types of development.</p> <p>Another consideration is that mineral extraction is ongoing and the pits have many years' life in front of them, so some of the site will not be available for development until after the time horizon of this Local Plan.</p> <p>The proposals offered as part of the last local plan were unworkable and would have resulted in severe disruption to the local communities and end up as a new medium sized town with limited facilities and no defined centre, just a mess of housing estates and employment sites along a feeder road that was billed as a new bypass for Platt and Borough Green. Because the site is offered to avoid the restitution costs of making good the quarries, it does not mean that TMBC should use it to create a new town. Any development on this site needs to be in keeping with its surroundings and not overstress the infrastructure which has already passed breaking point.</p> <p>The site also contains areas which are in Flood Zone 3b where the risk of flooding was 1 in 20 years, but is now likely to be more frequent due to climate change. this category is the 'functional flood zone' where has to flow or be stored during time of heavy rainfall, so they are the areas where flooding is most likely and longest lasting. They are also the areas where surface water drainage may require pumps and the water table is close to the surface so a hole dug will quickly fill with water.</p> <p>The benefits and drawbacks listed in the interim sustainability report apply to different areas of the site and are meaningless in the context of such a large site, leading to the conclusion that it should be broken up into smaller parcels of land for the appraisal so that the positives and negatives relate to specific areas within the overall site.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42717025	Annex 1	<p>Site ID 59613</p> <p>As a resident of East Peckham and the borough of Tonbridge and Malling I would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building.</p> <p>The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham.</p> <p>This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations.</p> <p>This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route.</p> <p>The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p> <p>We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42626337	Annex 1	<p>Site ID 59613</p> <p>As a resident of East Peckham for 25 years we would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building.</p> <p>The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham.</p> <p>This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations.</p> <p>This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route.</p> <p>The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p> <p>We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42626369	Annex 1	<p>Site ID 59613</p> <p>As a resident of East Peckham for 25 years we would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building.</p> <p>The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham.</p> <p>This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations.</p> <p>This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route.</p> <p>The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p> <p>We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42717185	Annex 1	<p>Site ID 59613</p> <p>As a resident of East Peckham for 25 years we would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building.</p> <p>The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham.</p> <p>This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations.</p> <p>This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route.</p> <p>The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p> <p>We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.</p>	<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. All forms of flood risk will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42753249	Annex 1	<p>Site ID 59613</p> <p>As a resident of East Peckham for most of my life we would strongly object to this proposed site being used for any future development.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this site would not be suitable or be able to sustain any new building.</p> <p>The site is in Flood zones 2 and 3, and as such all roads to the site flood. Any development would mean that surface water discharge from this site would cause further flooding downstream and of surrounding properties. Furthermore, the site would be completely isolated from the village during times of flooding. High ground water levels, and the use of soakaways are unsuitable for this area. The risk of flooding, and it's associated issues is an extremely important consideration and one that cannot be taken lightly. This has happened before and will continue to be an issue in East Peckham.</p> <p>This site is Green Belt land and as such should be protected. It is important to protect the rural setting of the village. In addition, building on this site would go against the established anticoalescence policy and the Hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and these local areas are important to our local history and landscape, and should be protected for future generations.</p> <p>This site has extremely poor accessibility, and is only accessible by narrow lanes that just could not cope with any increased traffic. Any development in this area would cause parking issues with most households having more than one car, which would create dangerous hazards on this already congested, narrow access route.</p> <p>The village of East Peckham is just that - a village. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain this development. The village has few facilities; there is no GP surgery and public transport is extremely limited. There is no rail station nearby, no parking at the nearest station, no lighting or pavement on the roads to the nearest station, and the roads to the nearest station are prone to flooding. As such, the village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p> <p>We very much hope that you take all these important factors into consideration, and conclude that this site is not a suitable option for development.</p>	<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. All forms of flood risk will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42436577	Annex 1	<p>Site number 59492. This is a well used car park in a local service centre where there is a shortage of parking available. Should it be developed, what alternative parking would be provided? I assume that the site is in Council ownership, so should be retained to provide parking within Borough Green Village.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site number 59621</p> <p>This is an area of outstanding beauty and pristine wildlife area on greenbelt land. This area is adjacent to Maceys Meadow which is owned by the parish and serves as an ecological and wildlife area. Building houses next to Maceys meadow would be a detrimental act against the community and environment expanding the limits of the village into green belt - also this is more than typical walking distance people are willing to make to get to the shops. Really poor accessibility/ road and rail/ no public transport</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site number 59645</p> <p>The site at Manor Farm is in an area of outstanding beauty and is near/close proximity to St Leonard's Tower. The oldest part of West Malling.</p> <p>Creating 42 new houses in such close proximity to a site of such historic interest would be of severe detriment to the local community and environment.</p> <p>This is prime agricultural land which would be a loss</p> <p>Public transport links - nearby bus stop has an uncertain future. Local school at cricket meadow is running at capacity - there would be no room to accommodate new families to the area with existing infrastructure</p>	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site number: 59620</p> <p>This is an area of outstanding beauty and pristine wildlife area on greenbelt land. This area is adjacent to Maceys Meadow which is owned by the parish and serves as an ecological and wildlife area. Building houses next to Maceys meadow would be a detrimental act against the community and environment expanding the limits of the village into green belt - also this is more than typical walking distance people are willing to make to get to the shops. Really poor accessibility/ road and rail/ no public transport</p>	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site number: 59622</p> <p>This is an area of outstanding beauty and pristine wildlife area on greenbelt land. This area is adjacent to Maceys Meadow which is owned by the parish and serves as an ecological and wildlife area. Building houses next to Maceys meadow would be a detrimental act against the community and environment expanding the limits of the village into green belt - also this is more than typical walking distance people are willing to make to get to the shops. Really poor accessibility/ road and rail/ no public transport</p>	Comment noted.
42771649	Annex 1	<p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat within this site is home to rare crested newts, which are protected by law as they are an endangered species. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted due to the Renovo Care home. The current single-track access road is unpaved and unlit and entirely unsuitable to further traffic congestion.</p>	Comment noted.
42096289	Annex 1	<p>59525</p> <p>This site should not be developed. It is a very important and well used asset to the community and is known as Westwood Green. To develop this site will be a tremendous loss to the community. On top of its social and recreational uses it is also a meeting point during times of emergency.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802753	Annex 1	<p>59646, 59747, 59806,</p> <p>Very narrow lanes between East Peckham and the sites. Two vehicles often struggle pass pass each other. Many roads to the site flood. The A26 floods Sites fall into flood zones 2 and 3. Sites include grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The sites are in the catchment area for the Coult Stream and Boroughs Oak Stream, both of which already regularly flood parts of East Peckham. Any surface water discharge from these sites will increase flood risk in East Peckham. Site is Green belt land. Site 59806 completely overwhelms two important heritage assets. If site 59806 is developed, no development should happen east of the A228 (Seven Mile Lane) to protect these assets. Views both of and from St Michaels Church will be ruined. If site 59806 is developed, a strong boundary of green belt must be maintained between it and Peckham Bush. An ancient pilgrimage trail runs through the sites. There is no rail station within 3 miles. Roads to the nearest two stations flood. There is no parking at Beltring station. The Parish of East Peckham has no GP Surgery. The village should be downgraded from a rural service centre to a rural settlement.</p>	<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.</p>
42096289	Annex 1	<p>59650</p> <p>This site is in areas of medium and high flood risk. Surface water discharge floods nearby properties and the Boriughs Oaks Steam runs directly adjacent to the site. This stream regularly bursts its banks and floods surrounding properties and roads. Sites 59742 and 59806 also have Boroughs Oak Stream running through them and development of them will increase flooding on site 59855. As a flood warden I object to this site being developed due to these longstanding flooding issues.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flood risk will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42096289	Annex 1	<p>59742</p> <p>This site is green belt land and currently has no access by road. It's is also flood zone 2 and 3.</p> <p>The Boroughs Oak Stream runs directly through the site and regularly floods properties and roads downstream on Hale St and beyond.</p> <p>This stream also floods sites 59855 and 59650.</p> <p>As a flood warden I must object to development of site 59742 due to these flooding issues.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42096289	Annex 1	<p>59789</p> <p>This site is green belt land. It has the Coult Stream, one of the three main rivers of the Borough, running directly through it.</p> <p>The site is located on flood zones 2 and 3 with extremely high ground water levels that make the use of SuDS unsuitable as minimum clearances stated in the SuDS manual cannot be achieved.</p> <p>The Coult Stream is a major source of flooding within the village and floods many roads and properties. Any surface water discharge into it will significantly increase flooding.</p> <p>As a flood warden I strongly object to this site being developed.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42096289	Annex 1	<p>59806</p> <p>This site has the Boroughs Oak Stream running through it as well as being the catchment area for the main river, the Coult Stream. Both these watercourses regularly flood properties and roads within East Peckham and development of site 59806 will significantly increase that flooding.</p> <p>Both these watercourse run through and flood many potential sites in the parish of Eadt Peckham.</p> <p>As flood warden I object to development of site 59806 and should it be developed the increased flood rush must be taken into account when considering other sites within East Peckham. Our flooding issues are severe. Over 800 of 1400 properties are at flood risk, by far the highest ratio in the borough. Major development a mile upstream from the village of East Peckham will create far worse flooding.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42096289	Annex 1	<p>59855</p> <p>This site is in areas of medium and high flood risk. Surface water discharge floods nearby properties and the Boriughs Oaks Steam runs directly adjacent to the site. This stream regularly bursts its banks and floods surrounding properties and roads.</p> <p>Sites 59742 and 59806 also have Boroughs Oak Stream running through them and development of them will increase flooding on site 59855.</p> <p>As a flood warden I object to this site being developed due to these longstanding flooding issues.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25349153	Annex 1	<p>Comments on sites proposed in East Malling</p> <p>The Reg 18 Local Plan states :-</p> <p>1.1.1. A Local Plan should be prepared in accordance with national planning policy within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>1. Countryside and ‘confines of the built up area’</p> <p>Sites outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC ‘s Proposals Map) and are designated as ‘countryside’. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that ‘planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’.</p> <p>2. Heritage assets</p> <p>Para 200 of the NPPF states :-</p> <p>“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:</p> <p>a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;</p> <p>b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional”.</p> <p>According to britishlistedbuildings.co.uk, there are 65 listed buildings in the parish of East Malling, including 4 Grade 1 (Clare House, Bradbourne House, its stable block and barns, and the Church of St. James). Any developments which would adversely affect the setting of these listed buildings should be rejected.</p> <p>3. Conservation Area</p> <p>There are several Conservation Areas around East Malling - New Barns and Broadwater Farm, Clare House Park, Mill Street, East Malling and Bradbourne House.</p> <p>TMBC seeks to ensure that existing built environments of an historic or high quality will be preserved or enhanced and to conserve and protect the historic environment, including Conservation Areas.</p> <p>4. Loss of prime agricultural land</p> <p>The DEFRA website shows that the sites surrounding the built up area of East Malling have very good soil classification,</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>with an area which includes the Broadwater Farm site having excellent. Para 174 (b) of the NPPF states :</p> <p>“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland”.</p> <p>Footnote 58 states “Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality”. We understand that soils of this quality are relatively rare in Kent, emphasising their importance in the Malling area.</p> <p>5. Quiet Lanes</p> <p>The Quiet Lanes network was registered under the Transport Act of 2000, which recognises the need to prioritise recreational use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders in these peaceful country lanes. This is a statutory designation in 2001 under the Transport Act 2000 and therefore a material consideration. It recognises the need to prioritise this area for recreation by walkers, cyclists and horse riders, over motorists. Water Lane and Lavenders Road, part of Broadwater Road, Stickens Lane, Well Street, Pikey Lane, The Heath and Sweets Lane are in the Quiet Lanes network.</p> <p>This Quiet Lane network must be protected.</p> <p>I comment on individual East Malling sites below:</p> <p>59448. Bradbourne Park Road</p> <p>This site is adjacent to the Bradbourne Conservation Area, whose setting would be adversely affected by a housing development on the site.</p> <p>This site should be rejected.</p> <p>59631 Wateringbury Road</p> <p>The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC ‘s Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as ‘countryside’. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that ‘planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape.</p> <p>Access to this site from the north would be through East Malling village. Chapel Street and the High Street are effectively single track roads because of parked cars, which interrupt the flow of traffic and create blind spots. Any increase in traffic will exacerbate this.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of ‘very good’. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states “Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality”.</p> <p>This site should be rejected.</p> <p>59636. Stickens Lane</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the Mill Street Conservation Area. The development will result in harm to the setting and views</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>into the Mill Street Conservation Area. The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also extend the built up area of East Malling westwards and erode the gap between East Malling and West Malling.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality".</p> <p>The Quiet Lane network, which includes the very narrow rural Stickens Lane and Pikey Lane, would be adversely affected by traffic emanating from the site.</p> <p>This site must be rejected.</p> <p>59698. Clare Lane</p> <p>The site is opposite Clare House, a Grade I listed building and opposite the Clare House Park Conservation Area. In TMBC's proposals map, Clare House Park is designated as SQ3 (b) Historic Parks and Gardens. The setting of Clare House and the Conservation Area will be adversely affected by a housing development on this site.</p> <p>The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap between West Malling and East Malling.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality".</p> <p>There is a narrowing of Clare Lane by the bend in the road between Broadwater Road and Clarewood Drive, which gives rise to a blind spot when driving between the two. Any extra traffic caused by this development would increase the safety hazard.</p> <p>This site must be rejected.</p> <p>59715. Ivy Farm</p> <p>The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Access to this site from the north would be through East Malling village. Chapel Street and the High Street are effectively single track roads because of parked cars, which interrupt the flow of traffic and create blind spots. Any increase in traffic will exacerbate this.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of ‘very good’. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states “Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality”.</p> <p>This site should be rejected.</p> <p>59726. Wateringbury Road</p> <p>The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC ‘s Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as ‘countryside’. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that ‘planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside.</p> <p>Access to this site from the north would be through East Malling village. Chapel Street and the High Street are effectively single track roads because of parked cars, which interrupt the flow of traffic and create blind spots. Any increase in traffic will exacerbate this.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of ‘very good’. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states “Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality”.</p> <p>This site should be rejected.</p> <p>59740. Broadwater Farm - 112.75 hectares - mixed use</p> <p>This site is identical to that of the yet to be determined 2021 planning application (21/02719), except for the omission of the area of land to the west of the bypass which was to be an open space. The site is outside the confines of West Malling and Kings Hill and is therefore designated as countryside. NPPF Para 174 applies ‘planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’ .</p> <p>The site impacts on both the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation Area and the Mill Street Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Kings Hill development was originally agreed to remain within the confines of the former airfield. The extent of the proposed site would cause unacceptable coalescence of Kings Hill with the urban areas of West Malling and East Malling. The quantum of houses that could be accommodated on the site would cause severe congestion in the local road network, and in particular to the Quiet Lanes in the area.</p> <p>The site is in an area of high grade agricultural land - some being Grade I and the rest Grade II. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states “Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality”.</p> <p>The existing planning application is for 900 houses. KCC therefore require two vehicular accesses. It is vital that neither</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>creates harm to the Conservation Areas of New Barns and Broadwater Farm and Mill Street and that the accesses are directly to the existing Kings Hill urban area.</p> <p>Other concerns are the harms to the aquifer for streams into East Malling and to non-listed heritage assets.</p> <p>This site must be firmly rejected.</p> <p>59743. Winterfield Lane</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the southern end of the Forty Acres development, where permission was granted on Appeal for 250 houses. It is opposite the Clare House Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap between West Malling and East Malling.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality".</p> <p>There is a narrowing of Clare Lane by the bend in the road between Broadwater Road and Clarewood Drive, which gives rise to a blind spot when driving between the two. Any extra traffic caused by this development would increase the safety hazard.</p> <p>This site must be rejected.</p> <p>59756 London Road (adjacent to Forty Acres)</p> <p>The site is in East Malling, not Leybourne. The site is adjacent to that recently approved for the development of 250 houses. The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent a further encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap even more between Leybourne and East Malling.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality".</p> <p>The strip on the northern side of London Road, opposite the site, is designated in TMBC's proposals map as OS1 (el) as an Open Space to be Protected. Development of the site would adversely affect the setting of this Protected area.</p> <p>This site must be rejected.</p> <p>59824. Clare Lane</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The site is adjacent to Clare House, which TMBC 's proposals map designates as SQ3 (b) Historic Parks and Gardens. Part of the site is opposite Clare House Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap between East Malling and Leybourne and West Malling.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality".</p> <p>This site must be rejected.</p> <p>59844. London Road</p> <p>Although this site is in Leybourne parish, it is adjacent to site 59756 and I comment below :</p> <p>The site is outside the confines of East Malling (as determined by TMBC 's Proposals Map) and is therefore designated as 'countryside'. Para 174 of the 2021 National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning decision should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. Development would detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape. It would also represent an encroachment of the built-up area into the countryside and erode the gap between East Malling and Leybourne and West Malling.</p> <p>The site has a soil classification of 'very good'. Footnote 58 of the NPPF states "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality".</p> <p>The strip on the northern side of London Road, opposite the site, is designated in TMBC's proposals map as as OS1 (el) as an Open Space to be Protected. Development of the site would adversely affect the setting of this Protected area.</p> <p>This site must be rejected.</p>	
42774561	Annex 1	<p>I object to most of the plans put forward, in particular 59842, 59686 and 59638. I object because Hadlow is already a very busy village, especially during week days when it is highly congested. More buildings would only have a negative impact on the roads and safety of residents. All the proposed sites are on greenbelt land, even though there are plenty of brown field sites in the South East. The doctor's surgery is already at capacity and the schools are not big enough to accommodate a large number of new children. Not to mention the negative impact buildings and vehicles will have on the local wildlife in the area. The land is already prone to flooding, which would be made worse by new housing in the area. I absolutely object to any planning of a number of dwellings in our village.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42800737	Annex 1	<p>I refer to the following site numbers:</p> <p>59605, 59635, 59637, 59638, 59647, 59686, 59776, 59842, 59853, 59857, 59601, 59811, 59859 and 59410</p> <p>All of these potential sites are either in or around the village of Hadlow and my comments therefore refer to all of them.</p> <p>My view is that further development of Hadlow is inappropriate for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whilst it might appear that certain sites could be accessed from the Maidstone Road (eg sites 59638, 59686, 59647 and 59637) the reality is that the development of such sites will just increase the pressure on roads that are already over-congested. The village already suffers from having the busy Maidstone Road running through it - further traffic should not be encouraged by developing Hadlow further. - much of the land around Hadlow is green belt land. I am firmly of the opinion that this should not be developed. To do so would change the character of the village which currently benefits very much from the open spaces on its edges, for recreation and for the mental health of the residents. In addition, there is the need to protect wildlife and encourage biodiversity. Green belt land has been designated as such for a reason and that reason continues to exist. This land is of great value to the Hadlow community. The fact that any proposed land is green belt land should be a significant negative to development. - the current infrastructure of Hadlow would not be able to accommodate any further development. The school is a single form entry typical village school. It is suited to the current size of the village. The doctor's surgery is already at capacity. Any suggestion of providing an additional school or doctor's surgery would only compound the problem of needing to develop further land in order to do so. My arguments above apply equally to this point. The population of the village is already high in relation to its facilities and the village can't support any further population increase. - many of the sites identified (especially 59638, 59686, 59647 and 59637) are very boggy - the Plan identifies areas which are at risk of flooding as being potentially suitable for development. There would need to be some way to divert this water away from the developed land (eg in relation to site 59637) which could cause damage to existing features such as the pond adjacent to plot 59638. <p>I hope the above considerations will be taken into account. While there are vacant land sites in and around Hadlow, it would seem to me that there are many other potential sites in the Local Plan which would be more suitable for development and more able to accommodate it.</p> <p>Many thanks, Katherine Flux</p>	<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.</p>
42746977	Annex 1	<p>I wish to object – in the strongest possible terms – to the selection of site 59811 as a potential area for residential development. The area is currently a large swathe of countryside surrounding Oxonhoath and is a significant distance from the centre of Hadlow.</p> <p>The reasons for my objection are as follows:</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>IGNORING TOWN PLANNING BEST PRACTICE ADVICE</p> <p>The structure of the village would become a sprawling mass to the north of Hadlow, with no clear centre. It would be ignoring recent independent advice from Urban Intelligence for Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council (TMBC Urban Capacity Study, July 2022) into potential options for housing which found that “no sites were identified in Hadlow”.</p> <p>VALUABLE COUNTRYSIDE / BIODIVERSE AREA</p> <p>The area is popular with residents of the village – dog walkers and ramblers alike – who use the network of paths on a regular basis. The loss of such a valuable space for the local community would be devastating, particularly given the importance of access to nature for mental health – something which was very important for residents during lockdown.</p> <p>INADEQUATE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>The supporting road network comprises a series of narrow lanes which would be unable support heavy traffic. The main bus network is along the A26 which runs through Hadlow – a significant walk along unlit lanes in the dark, which would be particularly dangerous in the evening.</p> <p>INADEQUATE SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>The existing schools and GP would struggle to support the additional needs of further residents who would be located at a distance from the village centre.</p> <p>AREA SUBJECT TO FLOODING</p> <p>Significant areas of the land are subject to flooding in the winter. This problem will only be exacerbated with more “hard surfaces”, preventing water from draining away.</p> <p>INACCURATE PLANNING</p> <p>Lastly, I am very concerned about the accuracy of the map provided, as there are a number of private houses contained within the area which have not been informed or consulted about this proposal and would be directly affected.</p>	
42783201	Annex 1	<p>ID 59410 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59601 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59635 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, requires significant greenfield land, Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59637 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, requires significant greenfield land, the loss of designated open spaces, Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic. Accessibility already poor.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59638 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, requires significant greenfield land, the loss of designated open spaces, and negatively impacts a green infrastructure asset, Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59647 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, requires significant greenfield and agricultural land land, negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59686 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59766 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, a green infrastructure asset and will and will have negative biodiversity impact and will result in the loss of designated open spaces. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic. Accessibility is already poor and the pressure from this proposed development would worsen that.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59811 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59842 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, requires significant greenfield land, will negatively impact a green infrastructure asset as well as biodiversity and geodiversity. This proposal will also negatively impact a heritage site. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic - especially given it is proposed in a location that currently only has a 'Fair' accessibility rating - this development would worsen that.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59853 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59857 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.
42783201	Annex 1	ID 59859 - Object based upon being in a flood zone, very close to a heritage asset, will negatively impact greenfield land and agricultural land, and will have negative biodiversity impact. Hadlow and surrounding area's infrastructure cannot support such development: at capacity for doctor, school, dentist, and road infrastructure cannot support the associated increase in traffic.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42793665	Annex 1	<p>Ref Site 59806</p> <p>As a local resident in Stanford Lane I am lodging a strong objection to any development of site 59806 on the following grounds:</p> <p>The local A roads (A26 and A228) which border this proposed site are already extremely congested at peak times. This leads to the local, very narrow rural lanes being used as rat runs. In particular Stanford Lane and Martins Lane are used as cut-throughs, particularly when the A26 or the A228 are blocked or congested. My daughter is a wheelchair user who is frequently forced into the verge by traffic travelling too fast. Any development in this area (and particularly of the potential scale proposed) would inevitably increase this traffic use and consequently the likelihood of more road traffic incidents. Local farm traffic already uses the lanes on a frequent and regular basis, often late into the evenings during harvest time and this can also cause conflict between the tractors and ordinary road users. The state of the tarmac at the sides of the local lanes is already poor, with significant large potholes which are dangerous for both vehicles having to pull over to allow another to pass and for pedestrians. There are no pavements provided. Greater traffic flows as a result of any development would only make this worse.</p> <p>Your own assessment records as a significant negative that this site is placed within the poor accessibility band.</p> <p>The whole area, and the roads and lanes in question, are frequently prone to flooding and the proposed site falls into flood zones.</p> <p>Our property, and our neighbouring properties, sit at the bottom of the long and large incline up towards St Michael's Church across the A228. If any of this area were to be developed then it would inevitably result in the further displacement of rainfall, with the subsequent precipitation being diverted down the hill to our properties. There is already inadequate drainage for existing flows of rainwater, resulting in large areas of the surrounding roads frequently being flooded; to add to this existing problem would simply be bad planning and would create more serious problems. Additional surface water discharge down the hill towards our properties will increase the existing flood risk. The fact that the location of the site is in Flood zone 3 is noted in your own assessment and should in and of itself be a reason to remove the site from the local plan. There are also water courses within the site area.</p> <p>The site currently sits within the green belt, includes both Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural land and is an outstandingly beautiful area, with the current views up to and including the ancient St Michael's Church forming a beautiful backdrop to the rural village of East Peckham. Any development on this site would ruin that view, both towards and from St Michael's Church. Any development on this site would adversely impinge upon two important local heritage assets, and interrupt an ancient pilgrimage trail.</p> <p>Your own assessment identifies that the site is within 250m of one or more internationally or nationally designated geodiversity sites and contains an existing green infrastructure asset. I dispute the view that any major development in the proximity could potentially enhance such an asset. As stated in your own assessment, the site is in greenfield land and as such this should not be built upon or developed. This precious resource should be preserved for all to enjoy in the future. Your assessment asserts the fact that the potential development could provide more than 100 dwellings as a positive. However, it is a misguided illusion to believe that simply dropping such a development into this area in order to sufficiently meet new housing quotas will be a sustainable or viable solution. And once done, an existing rural community will have been ruined forever.</p> <p>The site is currently used primarily for soft fruit production and this appears to be a thriving business, with new areas being turned over to further production in just the last two years.</p> <p>There is no local infrastructure to support new housing development on this site.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The local power supply is by overhead lines and is subject to frequent interruption.</p> <p>There is no mains gas supply to the area.</p> <p>There is no mains sewage, with local properties reliant upon private sewage treatment plants. Recent work to install a new plant at our property highlighted that the clay soil does not allow for adequate drainage, meaning that we had to install a bunded soakaway.</p> <p>There is no rail station within 3 miles and roads to the nearest two stations flood. There is no parking at Beltring station.</p> <p>The Parish of East Peckham has no GP Surgery. Hadlow GP Surgery is already overwhelmed and only staffed by part-time GPs.</p> <p>Local ambulance response times are already below standard.</p> <p>Local bus services have been reduced or cut.</p> <p>The local school provision is already inadequate and over-subscribed. There is no guarantee that any new residential development would stimulate the supply of additional educational capacity</p> <p>East Peckham, whilst being a vibrant rural community, does not have the resources to be graded as a rural service centre and should be redefined as a rural settlement.</p> <p>Please take account of all the above reasons and remove this potential site from the Local Plan to ensure that there will not be any future proposal to develop housing on this site.</p>	
42802177	Annex 1	Site 59591: Residential. I am the Bursar and Company Secretary at Tonbridge School, and I am responsible for this site. I did not submit it for development. I have no fundamental objection to it being developed, but would wish to be contacted if this is considered likely. Contact: [redacted]	Comment noted
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59610 Park Road Addington - The Parish Council would have no objection to the development of this site	Comment noted
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59628 Millhouse Lane Addington - The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site as we feel it would represent overdevelopment	Comment noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42784417	Annex 1	<p>Site 59707</p> <p>Comment for Objection to inclusion of site 59731 (& 59707)</p> <p>The key objections are based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Development on Green Belt land resulting in urban sprawl without evidence of extraordinary circumstances required to do so. Green belt exists to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and prevents neighbouring towns merging into one another. It is also required to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. * Development within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. * Development would affect the openness and visual amenity of and across the location would be severely compromised. This site offers extensive views across the AONB. * The Green Belt setting preserves the setting and special character of a historic settlement: The Conservation Area extends into the Green Belt, and the AONB also helps serve this function. * Overdevelopment of an existing community and services, increased traffic and demand on existing services. <p>Planning Policy to support the above objections</p> <p>NPPF 2021 Section 13 Protecting Green Belt land</p> <p>The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</p> <p>Paragraph 137</p> <p>Green Belt serves five purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; * to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; * to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; * to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and * to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>Paragraph 147</p> <p>Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>Paragraph 148</p> <p>When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Paragraph 149</p> <p>A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * a) buildings for agriculture and forestry; * b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; <p>NPPF 2021 Section 3, 16a A legal requirement of the plan is that a site should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development</p> <p>The score for this site is negative, Further consideration of the objectives will reduce this score further,</p> <p>Objective 3 (++)-To improve levels of educational attainment and</p> <p>skills and training development for all age groups and all sectors of society</p> <p>-The local primary schools (in Wrotham and Borough Green) are currently close to capacity and regularly have waiting lists for admissions. Both the primary school sites have traditionally constructed buildings that have been expanded over the years and would need significant changes to accommodate more pupils.</p> <p>- The local secondary school is frequently oversubscribed pupil numbers have already increased from 140 (in 2016) to 190 (in 2021).</p> <p>- There is a specialist school local to the area, although admission is limited to children with a KCC care plan and is fully subscribed.</p> <p>- Nursery/childcare facilities in the locality all have long waiting lists (often in excess of twelve months for pre-school children)</p> <p>- No further educational facilities are available outside of the local secondary school.</p> <p>Multiple housing developments are proposed in the locality, it will not be possible for them to utilise these facilities.</p> <p>NPPF 2021 Section 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities paragraph 95</p> <p>It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education.</p> <p>Objective 14 (++) To provide a suitable supply of high quality housing including an appropriate mix of sizes, types and tenures.</p> <p>- The density of housing proposed on this site will not provide high quality housing proportionate to the character and</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>or scale of the existing settlement abutting the proposed site. This is contrary to clause (5.9.20) The affordable housing necessary is not met.</p> <p>NPPF 2021 Section 20d) Conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>This site is located within The Green Belt, within an “Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty”, has the highest grade of agricultural land (grade 1) and falls outside of the rural settlement of Wrotham and it is open countryside. The plan describes a requirement to “safeguard green spaces”, a development in this location does not protect, or conserve the natural asset of the environment or heritage of the surrounding conservation area. A development on this site will ruin the visual amenity of the area.</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances are not applicable to this site. The number of properties could be accommodated in other locations. The development of 105 houses is not sufficient justification to build on this land.</p> <p>Other objections to the proposals</p> <p>Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2021-2026</p> <p>An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is exactly what it says it is: a precious landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard them.</p> <p>The historic settlement pattern remains an important distinctive component of the AONB.</p> <p>* Major development should avoid the Kent Downs AONB in line with NPPF guidance. Where it is decided that development will take place that will have a negative impact on the landscape character, characteristics and qualities of the Kent Downs AONB or its setting, mitigation and or compensatory measures appropriate to the national</p> <p>* Aside from these grand and dominant historic sites and structures, the multitude of smaller cultural and historic features also help characterise the landscape of the AONB. These are the traces of ordinary people who have worked the land for centuries and have shaped its special character. Networks of ancient, often ‘laid’ hedgerows which still provide enclosure for livestock; wood and field banks which marked boundaries between different manors or estates, picked out with pollarded or ‘stubbed’ ancient trees; field patterns and lynchets revealing ploughing patterns from centuries ago; hollow ways and sunken lanes, now often byways, carved into the land by millennia of passing feet and hooves; and dene holes (deep excavations into the chalk) and borrow pits where rock and minerals were excavated by hand</p> <p>* The historic environment helps shape new development in the AONB and its setting and contributes to a distinctive sense of place. This will be achieved by ensuring that the heritage is considered from the earliest stages of project development.</p> <p>PPG2</p> <p>PPG2: Green Belts – this sets out the Government’s policy for Green Belts which is to maintain their openness. It indicates that Green Belt boundaries should endure for the long-term and that there is a presumption against</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>inappropriate development within Green Belts I</p> <p>It is possible to find alternative locations for developments of this size, throughout the borough without compromising the AONB.</p>	
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59725 Ford Lane - The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site. Although we would be concerned about the loss of this site as a leisure facility and the tourism it brings to the area we feel it would be a good site for affordable homes given its proximity to the road network and bus services	Comment noted.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59730 Addington Lane - The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We have concerns about more vehicles accessing the road which regularly floods in this area	Comment noted. All forms of flood risk will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59736 - Addington Lane, Trottiscliffe - The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We have concerns about more vehicles accessing the road which regularly floods in this area	Comment noted. All forms of flood risk will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59812 Clearways, Addington - The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site and feel it would work well as a mixed-use site	Comment noted. All forms of flood risk will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59830 - Borough Green Garden City - The Parish Council is concerned about the fact that Borough Green will lose its identity and be swamped by this development. We are concerned about the effect on the infrastructure and the impact this will have on our village. The proposal would undoubtedly result in an unwelcome increase in traffic and pollution in Trottiscliffe which is already used as a rat-run. We recognise that this site could provide some housing but feel it should be on a smaller scale.	Comment noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42436577	Annex 1	<p>Site 59843: This site can only be accessed from Crouch Lane which is narrow and unlit. The flow of traffic up and down the lane has increased significantly over the years and there has been a noticeable increase in traffic when the A25 is congested with cars and vans cutting the corner from the A2016 Seven Mile Lane.</p> <p>The shape of the south end of the site implies that there may be scope to add a house between Oakview and The Little Spinney. There is also a gate giving access to this site from the spur leading to these two houses, but this access would add to congestion on one of the narrower lengths of the lane.</p> <p>The existing development at Tillmans could provide access to this site from the foot of the lane, but there is a shortage of parking spaces which make this development permanently congested with parked cars. If it were linked to site 59748, there would be potential for access through that other site, but then a risk of ratruns being used would arise when the A 25 is busy.</p> <p>The sewer through Borough Green and Platt is in very poor condition and close to capacity so any development of these sites may well required a new sewer to accept the outfall from this side of Borough Green. The electrical infrastructure would also need improvement as a pole mounted transformer serves the houses on Crouch Lane as far as Pine Hall.</p> <p>Should this site be developed it will overlook the Recreation Ground in Maidstone Road. Any permission should require the retention of the tree screen so that the greenness of the recreation ground is retained.</p>	Comment noted.
38330689	Annex 1	Site 59850 - East of Addington Village - The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We feel that any further development would destroy the openness of the area	Comment noted.
42801473	Annex 1	<p>Site Ref: 59811</p> <p>This site is wholly inappropriate for development generally and certainly not for over 2,000 houses. The issues include the following, some of which are noted in the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The site can only be accessed via narrow country lanes * There is a lack of essential services - no gas, no mains drainage and electricity supply with low voltage * The site seems to take in some of an area of Historic Parks and Gardens and borders a Conservation Area * No local amenities / schools / healthcare facilities * The area does not border any existing dense housing / the development would interrupt open countryside * The development would likely significantly reduce access to Public Footpaths and Bridleways 	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42192289	Annex 1	When adding my initial comments, I exceeded the data levels allowed. After several attempts to load my comments, they went through in total on Comment ID /142. I have deleted all the other versions.	Noted.
42786433	Annex 1	<p>Response to Site Proposal Number 59811 – land surrounding Oxon Hoath estate, Hadlow.</p> <p>I strongly object to the above site being included in the TMBC Local Plan for the reasons given below:</p> <p>* This site sits within established Green Belt Land. Paragraph 140 of the NPPF states: “Once established Green belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified”. It goes on to say that “the policy making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options” these include: “suitable brownfield sites” and “other locations well served by public transport” etc. This site sits firmly in a rural area, on an isolated site away from any existing dwellings, surrounded by country lanes, no public transport and within the Green Belt.</p> <p>* Furthermore, the Report on Urban Capacity Study undertaken by Urban Intelligence for TMBC in July 2022 has gone some way in identifying potential sites for TMBC to reach the housing requirement within the borough by 2040. This states that TMBC is 71% covered with Green Belt Land. This study has identified sites within the existing urban areas and rural service centres, most importantly looking at suitability, capacity and density optimisation in the most accessible locations. They have identified a number of potential sites. Page 3 states “No sites were identified in the rural service centres of Hildenborough and Hadlow”. Page 29 Summarises findings for Hadlow – Point “7.1 - No sites identified by Hadlow”. They did however find other potential sites in the borough. Therefore site 59811 has not been recommended in a hugely detailed study, undertaken by a company paid by TMBC, with the expertise required to advise them on urban capacity and viability analysis.</p> <p>* The 5 purposes of Green Belt designation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * To restrict unrestricted urban sprawl, * Prevent coalescence of neighbouring settlements, * Safeguarding the countryside, * Protect the setting and character of historic towns, * Assist or encourage urban regeneration. As stated above by Urban Intelligence there are far more suitable sites within the TMBC local area requiring urban regeneration and which are far better served by public transport and access routes than site 59811. <p>* Accessibility – this site is served by narrow, winding and at times, single track lanes to all sides. There is no public transport provided by TMBC to any area near the site. In fact local bus services are currently being reduced to both Hadlow (over 1 mile away to the nearest corner of this site) on the east and Dunks Green/Plaxtol to the West. Traffic congestion is already a problem on the A26 through Hadlow, as is road safety for the local residents, primary school and secondary school children and staff. This small village and local area cannot support any additional traffic that dwellings on the surrounding areas would generate – particularly due to the lack of public transport and inadequate infrastructure. As Stated in the SA Objective 2: Significant Negative: The site is placed within the Poor Accessibility Band. Which is an understatement – cars, lorries and buses cannot pass each other with clear passage on any of the surrounding roads.</p> <p>* Utilities – local houses recently received letters from Southern Water stating that Kent is a stressed area and all houses, particularly those to the North of site 58911 regularly experience significant water supply issues. The site currently has electricity to only two dwellings and no mains gas supply. To significantly enhance the utilities supplied to this site would cause largescale disruption to the surrounding landscape and communities, putting pressure on already limited services and having huge environmental impact.</p> <p>* Impact on Environment – the land identified in site 58911 currently sits to the west of Hadlow and contains open rural land, rivers, woods and wildlife habitats. There are frequent sightings of owls, buzzards, bats and badgers. To disturb badgers and bats is a criminal offence. The site also includes ancient trees and rivers providing sanctuary for</p>	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>local wildlife. Trees and green spaces are integral to combatting the climate crisis and should be preserved as much as possible, they release oxygen and help to combat pollution. The loss of the trees on this site, were a development be allowed, will expose local residents to increased pollution levels, not least adding to the already increased pollution levels due to traffic. As stated in SA Objective 5: To Protect and enhance Biodiversity & Geodiversity: Significant Negative – the site is within 250m of one or more internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites.</p> <p>* Local amenities – we understand the local Doctors surgery and schools are at capacity. They cannot accommodate any more residents in the local area of Hadlow or the surrounding villages. As stated in SA Objective 3: Minor Negative – The site is more than 800m from an existing secondary school and a primary school. There are no bus services going anywhere near this site, nor public footpaths into the village of Hadlow from this site. Children would have to walk over a mile to school along the roads with no pavements.</p> <p>* Significant Heritage Building – The map of site 59811 does not mark the situation of the Grade II* Listed Mansion House of the Oxon Hoath estate and 16th Century Grade II* Listed Dower house. These are buildings in total of over 30,000 sq ft with historic parkland and a Georgian walled garden. The gardens are Grade II* listed and extend to 74 acres. The gardens contain the only surviving unaltered parterre gardens in England today. As stated in SA Objective 7: To protect and enhance the cultural heritage resource – Significant negative: the site is located within 250m of a heritage asset. A considerable understatement!</p> <p>* As per the Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment review undertaken by ARUP for TMBC in July 2022, TMBC must demonstrate strategic level exceptional circumstance to justify the release of Green Belt Land as well as exceptional circumstances for the release of specific sites. This must be linked with the Local Plan Strategy, the reasonable alternatives for delivering growth (as assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal) as well as the findings from the Green Belt Reviews and site assessment.</p> <p>* Page 15 of ARUP's report – Figure 3.3 shows the majority of Site 59811 consisting of Parks and Gardens sitting within the Green Belt. With Ancient and Semi Natural Woodland to the North and East. They go on to state on Page 16 – "The location within the Green Belt, combined with the tightly drawn boundaries, minimises the potential for the settlements to accommodate growth over the long-term". SA Objective 8: To protect and enhance the quality of water features and resource – significant negative. The site is either entirely or significantly within Flood Zone 3. The site also contains a water body or water course or falls within or partially within Source Protection Zone 1.</p> <p>* In summary, we believe that this rural parcel of Green Belt land that contains a significant Listed Grade II* heritage asset and listed parklands as well as ancient woodland, with very poor access, utility provision and amenities is not suitable for TMBC to consider as a site within the local development plan.</p>	
45742881	Annex 1	Boyer assessment of the council's analysis for site ref. 59852.	noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42833057	Annex 1	59613 Narrow roads without adequate parking, flood risk area. Green belt area, flood zone 2&3.	Comment noted
42771489	Annex 1	All the comments I inserted into the Interim sustainability appraisal Annx 1 have disappeared when I pressed Submit comments.	noted
42824993	Annex 1	<p>I am writing to OBJECT against any development on the following sites:</p> <p>Site 59432 - Oxley Shaw Lane</p> <p>Site 59441 - Castle Way</p> <p>Site 59442 - Castle Way</p> <p>Site 59443 - Lillieburn</p> <p>Site 59445 - Oxley Shaw Lane</p> <p>I have lived in Leybourne since 1982 with my husband and family. We chose to live here because of the green land open spaces. We continue to enjoy these spaces regularly with our children and now grandchildren.</p> <p>During Covid we also were able to find mental relaxation by visiting these sites, which are on our doorstep.</p> <p>I believe that If these sites are taken away and used for development it would not only be very detrimental to our wellbeing, but also to others, from youngsters to the elderly. My mother, who sadly died during the height of Covid, also lived at Leybourne by herself, found her daily walks where she would meet and chat to many people and that would brighten her day in such a positive way. These spaces are so important for many people, PLEASE do not take them away.</p>	Comment noted.
42823169	Annex 1	<p>I am writing to object against any development on the sites listed below. The reason I am objecting is that I live in Leybourne village, all 5 sites are located in Leybourne village, they are all recreational green land spaces which I, my wife, my children, and my grandchildren, all use on a regular basis and if developed upon it would be detrimental to our well-being and potentially cause mental stress to us all. Please do not approve any development on these sites:</p> <p>Site 59432 (Oxley Shaw Lane)</p> <p>Site 59441 (Castle Way)</p> <p>Site 59442 (Castle Way)</p> <p>Site 59443 (Lillieburn)</p> <p>Site 59445 (Oxley Shaw Lane)</p>	comment noted.
42824609	Annex 1	<p>I live on Beaver Road and I object to houses being built on site 59852. There is a shortage of green spaces in the area and this site is key for the residents to be able to go for a walk which is imperative for their mental health. I'm addition, there is a shortage of local amenities such as schools and doctors surgeries.</p> <p>Please do not build on this site and maintain it as a village green.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42817953	Annex 1	I object to housing development in Mereworth	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42783297	Annex 1	<p>I wish to register my complete disapproval of the application for proposed development of site No.59811 which comprises the rural area of Park Farm, outside the village of Hadlow, and lying actually astride Common Rd. and bounded by Matthews Lane and the upper parts of Carpenters Lane.</p> <p>* This is a very extensive farmed area of historic interest, having been recorded in the Domesday Book and has preserved its nature even throughout the two World Wars, contributing significantly to supporting UK food resources.</p> <p>* This continuity marks its value in terms of its CURRENT varied productivity at a time when national food resources are under threat, being vital for our independence. Sustained viability depends on the scale involved, and this is achieved not only by maintaining its scope, in this case for a large very productive dairy herd, but also because it has the capacity to raise feed crops etc. such as maize (this year)</p> <p>* UK's FUTURE food productivity is at stake as it depends on enhancing agricultural assets, not depleting them</p> <p>* The impact on the wider environment would be significant in view of the long established hedges, mature trees, ponds, orchard platt and watercourses involved.</p> <p>* This wildlife is important not only for the wider balance of nature, but as a FREE resource for locals of all ages besides visitors, from dog walkers to riders and cyclists who daily use the combination of lanes and public Rights of Way. Ease of access from the village is crucial particularly for those without transport, whilst the variety of environments from open fields to the super views over the Weald, the historic features around Oxenhoath House offer plenty of alternatives year round, as was the case during lockdowns.</p> <p>* The narrow lanes encompassing the application are completely incapable of carrying the implied increase of traffic of all sorts, and the village is unable to provide sufficient parking or shopping for a wider community.</p> <p>* Bus services are already limited and confined to the through route Maidstone/Tonbridge because of narrow side roads and could not provide alternative options</p> <p>* Poor drainage is a serious intermittent event, with flooding along both Common Rd. and on Carpenters Lane - an annual, unsolved, issue.</p> <p>* The map provided is inaccurate in respect of many details, especially relating to private homes along the perimeters for example</p>	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
39066721	Annex 1	Our response to the sustainability appraisal of sites 59858, 59864 and 59866 is provided within our response to Question 8 of the main consultation	noted.
42832833	Annex 1	Please see our comments on the relevant objectives submitted in our letter emailed 03.11.22.	noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42818273	Annex 1	<p>Response to Site Proposal Number 59811 - land surrounding Oxon Hoath estate, Hadlow.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed site surrounding the Oxon Hoath estate. My objections are based on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It fails the Green Belt Development test. The proposed site significantly fails to meet the criteria set out with the National Planning Policy Framework for development within the Green Belt. The NPPF is clear that 'established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified'. This test is not met. The site sits firmly within the long established Green Belt. The site is rural, surrounded by country lanes, and there's no public transport. 2. Flooding. I walk the public footpaths identified in site 58911 frequently. In winter, parts of the area are subject to repeated flooding. If development were to go ahead, given the increase in hard surfaces and associated water run-off, the housing itself and especially housing in Hadlow between the site and the River Bourne would be significantly at greater risk of flooding. In living memory, the entire village centre of Hadlow flooded. 3. Access. The site is in a 'Poor Assessability Band'. There are no walkable train stations. Currently there's no public transport near the site and the single lane access roads in a number of the site's entry points would make the provision of buses problematic. The existing bus service in Hadlow is poor at best. The local road infrastructure can barely support the existing traffic let alone another 150+ dwellings. A number of the roads such as Steers Place are single track. Traffic congestion is already a problem on the A26 through the village and on Carpenters Lane. Road safety and noise pollution are similarly problems. 4. Impact on the Environment. In the assessment, insufficient regard has been paid to the unique and diverse nature of the wildlife. There is recorded evidence of Greater Crested Newts immediately adjacent to the proposed development in the pond at Mallards on Steers Place some 200 yards south of the proposed site. Greater Crested Newts and their associated breeding grounds are protected by law. Development on the proposed site risks those breeding grounds. Whilst out walking on the public footpaths through the proposed site, I have often and recently seen evidence of bats and badgers. Bats and badgers are similarly protected by law. <p>In summary, the case for the development to be considered for the local plan and/or for planning has not been made. There would be strong grounds for a legal challenge. It would not be appropriate to approve development of this site for the reasons given above and no doubt for other considerations. There are plenty of other sites in Tonbridge and Malling that better fit the criteria. Protracted legal challenge would be costly for the council and easy for the opponents of this site to win.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59406</p> <p>This is prime farm land - loss of which is detrimental to the area</p> <p>Also the green belt land loss of open space is negative to the local population</p>	Comment noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42814401	Annex 1	<p>Site 59424</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * DEFRA Forest Inventory * Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees * Over Developmentwith inadequate resources in Kings Hill - In particular GP Surgery * Harm toprotected species * Outside of the confines ofexisting developments * Impact on Local Residents of main access * Impact on wildlife corridor <p>Site 59531</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Change of character of the area * Loss of public open space <p>Site 59534</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Change of character of the area * Loss of public open space <p>Site 59544</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Harm to conservation areas (nesting bats in particular) * Harm tonon-listed heritage assets (Gun emplacement), preservation order <p>Site 59547</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Harm to conservation areas * Change of character of the area * Loss of public open space <p>Site 59655</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Green Belt * Countryside * Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, will create a rat run through Kings Hill * Outside of the confines of existing developments * Loss of agricultural land * Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59761</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ancient Woodland(Part of site) * Green Belt * Countryside * Access issues to A228 will cause issues with narrowest part of the road <p>Site 59797</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of agricultural land * Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks * Countryside * Harm to conservation areas * Green Belt * Harm to the aquifer for streams * Outside of the confines of existing developments * Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59800</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Silly consideration as 5 holes of an 18 hole, privately owned, golf course * No access to Kings Hill without knocking down houses or further development into Golf Course * Outside of the confines of existing developments * Harm to the aquifer for streams * Green Belt * Countryside * Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks * Loss of agricultural land * Insufficient access via single track Canon Lane for scale of development with no scope for improvement/widening given existing houses and dangerous access point onto a blind corner of A26. <p>Site 59802</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * No access to Kings Hill without knocking down houses or further development into Golf Course * Outside of the confines of existing developments * Harm to the aquifer for streams * Green Belt * Countryside * Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks * Loss of agricultural land * Insufficient access via single track Canon Lane for scale of development with no scope for improvement/widening given existing houses and dangerous access point onto a blind corner of A26. <p>Site 59844</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Change of character of the area * Loss of public open space 	
42821793	Annex 1	<p>Site 59432</p> <p>The area is widely used by local walkers and dog owners as leading down to the local woodland and stream.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42821793	Annex 1	<p>Site 59441</p> <p>This is the main recreation area in the village with a play ground and a exercise facility . which are both widely used.</p>	Comment noted.
42821793	Annex 1	<p>Site 59445</p> <p>This area is used for recreation and the children's play area that has been placed by the parish council.</p>	Comment noted.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59447</p> <p>I believe this site should be excluded from going forward as part of the Local Plan as parking in West Malling town is already under stress and the removal of the carpark this land occupies would be very harmful to the town's continuing prosperity.</p>	Comment noted.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59448</p> <p>Car parking provision is essential for West Malling town's on going economic success therefore this site should not go forward in the Local Plan as it would lead to the loss of such parking provision.</p>	Comment noted.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59594</p> <p>I believe this site should be excluded from going forward in the Local Plan as it is on Green Belt Lane and is partly within a Conservation Area. It would cause harm to the heritage asset of St Leonards Tower and Malling Place and lead to the loss of agricultural land. Its proximity to the Lancaster Gate site means that any development would effectively lead to the coalescence of West Malling and Kings Hill which must be avoided.</p>	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59596</p> <p>building here would mean loss of open space and have a severe impact on the local wood/ environmental habitat/wildlife</p> <p>This land is virgin greenbelt and this is a negative impact on the local population</p> <p>Access to this site is very poor and adding access/improving to cater for 23 houses would add more to all the points mentioned above</p>	Comment noted.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59602</p> <p>I believe this site should be excluded from the Local Plan going forward as its development to ensure there is no further encroachment on the individual identities of the settlements in and around West Malling and Kings Hill. The whole area in danger of coalescing so further development should be limited. The site is outside the confines of West Malling and would lead to the loss of agricultural land.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59603</p> <p>I believe this site should be excluded from the Local Plan going forward as its development to ensure there is no further encroachment on the individual identities of the settlements in and around West Malling and Kings Hill. The whole area in danger of coalescing so further development should be limited. The site is outside the confines of West Malling and would lead to the loss of agricultural land.</p>	Comment noted.
42833345	Annex 1	<p>Site 59613 is not an appropriate site for development.</p> <p>The area is a flood zone, the houses in this area regularly flood. Extra housing would mean more surface water and therefore more flooding. Current houses would suffer and the new houses will be built to flood.</p> <p>The access to this site is poor. And the current roads cannot cope with more traffic, especially large vehicles needed to built a residential site. All roads to the site currently flood.</p> <p>The area is green belt land which needs protecting.</p> <p>The area of Snoll Hatch is a character area. Adding more houses will destroy the areas beauty, uniqueness and history.</p> <p>Building on this site goes against established coalescence policies. Snoll Hatch is a hamlet and must be kept separate from East Peckham.</p> <p>The village does not have appropriate services to support this development. No GP surgery, a small school. The nearest train station has no parking.</p> <p>Highly inappropriate site.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42821889	Annex 1	<p>Site 59613, 59876 and 59837 - These areas are located around Snoll Hatch. We recently purchased a listed property here. The area of the sites in question is on a conservation area, and a character area especially Site 59613 with postcode TN12 5DX which shares a postcode with my property. It was especially difficult to buy in this area due to the conservation area status and the fact that the area is in a direct flood path, in zones 2 and 3, meaning insurance companies were difficult to find. We had both surface water flood and general flood warnings from the two rivers nearby appear on our surveys which made our solicitor, surveyor and the insurance companies very hesitant Even today after rain overnight this area has roads flooded (whereby pavements and roads are impassible) and the local flood warden has had to look at the nearby rivers to assess the risk. There is poor accessibility, when floods have occurred in the area we are stuck and unable to go to the left towards the pound or the right towards little mill. All local roads around the sites flood. Narrow lanes would not cope with any additional footfall or the large machinery that would need to get through, considering in this area existing houses are already on both sides of the road mean the road cannot be extended to be made bigger. There are also parking issues in the locality. The land in question is within the green belt but also goes against the established anti coalescence policy, the hamlet of Snoll Hatch must be kept separate and these sites would mean we are not. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. Snoll Hatch as a hamlet should be given rural settlement status.</p> <p>Site 59855, 59650 and 59782 - Hale street is also a historic hamlet that needs to be kept separate from East Peckham. The land in question is all greenbelt with narrow lanes. Building on this land goes against the anti coalescence policy to protect these areas. The lanes are narrow and again have houses on both sides of the road meaning expansion cannot happen. The roads between hale street and village amenities flood, and are in flood zones 2 and 3, the sites then become isolated. Surface water that could be brought on from building in this area will undoubtedly escape to already existing watercourses, which already struggle and cause flooding currently, let alone with water increase which will undoubtedly increase the risk of flooding to other areas downstream. High ground water levels mean soakaways are unlikely to be an option for these sites. Sites 59855 and 59782 both contain the CLH pipeline system. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.</p> <p>Site 59789 and 59682 - This area is in a known flooding area, caused by surface water and natural flooding. A main river the Coult Stream runs through this site and regularly floods, currently in flood zones 2 and 3, even moving this stream could cost flooding to other parts of the local area that already deal with the risk of flooding. There are narrow lanes with poor access. There is very poor accessibility, especially in times of difficulty such as flooding. The site becomes isolated. The site is on greenbelt land and should be conserved for future generations. This land is making Hale Street and East Peckham joined, going against the coalescence policy that requires them to always be kept separate. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads. The street lighting is non existent along parts of the local area.</p> <p>Site 59813 - This green belt site creates connection between East Peckham and Hate street going against the coalescence policy to keep the hamlet separate. There are narrow lanes in which the large amount of traffic added</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>through either building or more residents the roads would not cope with. There are properties on each side of the road which will mean that the expansion of facilities for this could not happen on existing roads. This site floods and is in zones 2 and 3. The high ground water levels mean soakaways are likely to be unsuitable, it will also encourage surface water to be displaced and moved further downstream effecting other communities. The CLH fuel pipeline runs through this site. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.</p> <p>Site 59525 - This land is a tiny patch of area, it would not provide the amount of houses needed to justify the disruption of the whole village and local hamlets to build on. It is surrounded by narrow lanes, is isolated in times of flooding. It is surrounded in times of flood and means that it is pretty isolated. It is in flood zones 2 and 3 roads to this area flood, today after heavy rain fall I walked there myself and some of the roads and pavements were underwater. The site is directly between Snoll Hatch, Bullen Corner, which are all conservation and character areas. the area is already built up meaning that the roads are set as they are and cannot be expanded. The properties in the locality will then be under further strain, such as for light into their house. There are mature trees on this site that would have to be destroyed. The land itself is currently used for the community with singing groups, keep fit, parades, Salvation Army events, football, a safe area for children to play outdoors. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.</p> <p>Sites 59639, 59640, 59753 - this area is especially rural, green belt land, the lanes are particularly small, with sometimes only 1 vehicle sizes and passing points, this would disrupt any one living or commuting in this area. Vehicles often struggle to pass each other. The site itself is in flood zone 1, the entire of bush road floods and all roads to the site also flood. It has very poor accessibility and is so removed in distance from the village that to go to the shop they would have to take a 5 minute car drive, impossible when in times of flooding. The road has no pavement or lighting. High ground water means that soakaways might be unsuitable. Peckham Bush, in which these sites lay is a hamlet that needs to be kept separate from East Peckham. Bush Road holds an animal sanctuary who benefit from the quiet and less frequent traffic that rural living allows. There is an ancient pilgrimage trail that passes through the land, legally allowing those on that pilgrimage to pass through. If this was to be built on there would need to be confirmation and agreement the owners allow the path to permanently be accessible. There are many heritage assets also within 250m of the site. The site is grade 1 and 2 agricultural land which we have been told as constituents should not be built on. The proposed new town next to the A26 will cause further flooding to this area and also others locally. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.</p> <p>Sites 59747, 59806, 59846 - This area is nearly twice the size of east Peckham, adding a lot of strain onto resources of the local area. There are very narrow lanes leading to these sites from East Peckham where often two vehicles struggle to pass each other. The sites fall into flooding zones 2 and 3 and the A26 itself floods. The sites are on grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. The area is local to the Coult's Stream and Borough Oaks Stream which both already flood local areas let alone when further surface water is drained into them. The sites are all on green belt areas. There are historical assets locally that these sites would overwhelm. The views of and from St Michaels church will be ruined, there is also an ancient pilgrimage trail which runs through the sites. Peckham Bush and these sites need to be kept separated by greenbelt land to protect the hamlets locally. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.</p> <p>Site 59616 - This site is exactly where water returns to the medway after flooding. Building here could make flood waters worse, higher and longer to clear. The site is in a flood zone 3. The roads to this site flood. The site overlooks residential properties and gardens. The site has the river medway, which floods, directly on its boundary. Branbridges estate must be kept separate from East Peckham. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.</p> <p>Site 59646 - This land is right next to the river medway, it holds this boundary through the whole site. This is a flood plain that helps protect the village of east Peckham. The fields are expectionally close and help to ensure there is a level of absorption so that the local areas don't get the flooding. Building here could result in other local communities getting the full brunt of the flooding by displacing the water back into the village. Pinkham Lane, Old Road, Medway Meadows, Branbridges and Snoll Hatch would suffer a lot from an increased flood risk. The river Bourne and the river medway meet on this river just up from Snoll Hatch, in a straight line from Little Mill. The site is entirely in flood zone 3. The surface is always very wet. There is massive erosion on the bank of the river and every few months more repairs have to be completed as the river is very wide, very fast and very high. There will be no option of moving this river and extensive work would have to be completed in order to make it workable for building property. East Peckham flood wardens cannot reach this area during flooding without risking life so would be unable to assess. There is also extreme risk of loss of life during flooding in this area generally. soakaways could be unsuitable for this area. The hamlet of Beltring must also be separate from East Peckham and this is putting that into doubt. The area itself is very well used by the community, the war and peace show is a huge addition to the area as well as the various concerts and also the local camping which brings a lot of tourists to the local area. The land it green belt but also green belt that is accessable to everyone historically. Aunts of my partner still remember the routes and children they took through the fields and that was over 70 years ago. The local area also has a variety of nature that should be protected including swans, kingfishers, newts, water voles etc. and building on this site will disrupt that, also the removal of ancient trees will again not help with the flood risk of the area. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.</p> <p>Site 59742 - Is land is green belt. It is in flood zones 2 and 3. It is isolated from the village, especially in times of flooding. The stream on this land runs directly through this land and regularly floods the land, the roads and properties nearby including on Hale street. Any increase in water to this stream will likely increase the flood risk to everyone nearby. There is also a lot of nature nearby including Egrets. In regards to facilities access is poor, there is no GP Surgery, there is no local high school a walk away, there is no local station to walk to, all of the stations locally you have to drive to, the closest not having parking and these roads also flood. There is also no regular bus service and the bus service there is has difficulty on the roads.</p>	
42833057	Annex 1	<p>site 59616</p> <p>This is where water goes back into river when it floods, therefore this area would not only be at risk of flooding but also disperse flood water further into the village causing more flooding.</p>	Comment noted. All forms of flood risk will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42806753	Annex 1	<p>Site 59623</p> <p>This site was refused planning permission for demolition and rebuild of 13 dwellings in March 2022. It is disappointing to see it back on plans (despite the proposed number of dwellings to have shrunk to 5).</p> <p>I do not think this site is suitable for redevelopment for more than 2/3 dwellings due to proximity to the already congested Shipbourne Road roundabout and funnel neck between Yardley Park Road and Portman Place. An increase in vehicles coming and going from this site would be dangerous. There is already a real danger for pedestrians at this roundabout and the crossing on Yardley Park Road.</p> <p>I do not believe this historical building should be demolished.</p> <p>Demolishing it would harm the Tonbridge Conservation Area and not be in keeping with the upper part of Yardley Park Road.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the plot would be overbearing on the adjacent plot.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the plot does not appear to be in keeping with the NPFF.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59631</p> <p>Planning permission has already been refused for this site so TMBC should have access to the valid reasons for this refusal which haven't substantially changed. This site is in the countryside and any development would contribute to its increasing urbanisation and I believe it shouldn't go through to the next phase of the Local Plan.</p>	Noted. However, comments on specific planning applications are Development Management matters. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59645</p> <p>I believe this site should not go forward in the Local Plan. It is on Green Belt land and outside the confines of West Malling. Any development of this site would cause harm to the setting of, and views into, the associated Conservation Area. Additionally it would cause harm to the setting of Douces Manor and St Mary's Church. The agricultural land of this site is a valuable resource which would be lost for ever if developed.</p> <p>The traffic which would be associated with any development of this site is likely to add even more stress to the difficult junction of West Street and the High Street.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833057	Annex 1	<p>Site 59646 Hop Farm Land</p> <p>Massively unsuitable for development, greenbelt land with woodland and rare nightingales. Beautiful riverbank that needs to remain part of nature. Zone 3 flood area. Cut off from village in a flood, very close to river Medway therefore a risk to flood wardens. Building will increase risk of Medway and Bourne flooding affecting the whole of East Peckham, and Snoll Hatch in particular.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59648</p> <p>this area is of outstanding beauty and the loss of prime open space greenbelt is detrimental to the population.</p> <p>Prime farmland loss/. far away from any amenities would force people to drive and consequently have a negative impact on the environment</p>	Comment noted.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59649</p> <p>site 59648</p> <p>this area is of outstanding beauty and the loss of open space is detrimental to the population.</p> <p>Far away from any amenities would force people to drive and consequently have a negative impact on the environment</p>	Comment noted.
42803265	Annex 1	<p>Site 59665 this is agricultural land and should not be built upon. If planning is consented it will cause further road congestion, light pollution and destroy natural habitat.</p> <p>Site 59600 there is already a huge amount of commercial buildings on this area, further road congestion and light pollution.</p> <p>Site 59709 currently an area of open space, possibly green belt. It would be a shame to loose this green space.</p> <p>Site 59680 this field has been used for grazing of sheep and agricultural use for many many years. Employment on this land would be outrageous. The A20 in this area is a bottle neck at peak times and always busy so additional traffic would make it impossible. Light and noise pollution would occur.</p> <p>Site 59643 & Site 59706 a green area which would be lost causing additional traffic onto the already busy A20 and light pollution .</p> <p>Site 59681 further building on this site would destroy ancient woodland, natural wildlife habitats, cause extra traffic onto the busy A20, light pollution.</p> <p>Site 59880 construction of 132 houses on this land would destroy agricultural land. The site would mean a huge increase of cars accessing the A227 Wrotham by pass road which is an extremely busy and fast road.</p> <p>Site 59830 this huge development would destroy the unique and separate villages of Ightham, Borough Green, Platt, Wrotham and Wrotham Heath. The absolutely huge amount of additional traffic/people etc would be impossible to manage with the infrastructure in place. The light, air and noise pollution would be a huge problem for all. Some of the site land is still being quarried whilst other quarries have been left to successfully re-wild themselves and if development took place it would be a disaster for the wildlife.</p> <p>Site 59881 construction of 238 houses on the agricultural land should not be allowed. The access onto the A227 would be very dangerous and the road is extremely busy in both directions at many times of the day. The light, air and noise pollution would be extreme. This land is also edged with wild areas and is a habitat for many different wildlife - bats, owls and deer are often spotted.</p> <p>Site 59712 the construction of 73 houses would destroy a green field (possibly green belt), a regularly used and popular</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		footpath for local residents.	
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59699 church farm</p> <p>this is a large area of valuable farmland which would be a significant loss if developed.</p> <p>Enlarging the village into prime greenfield land would ruin the beauty and natural surroundings as well as reduce and have a negative impact on wildlife and the environment</p> <p>Transport to this area comprises of small country lanes not suitable for the traffic of 260 homes</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59699</p> <p>I believe this site should not go forward in the Local Plan. It is on Green Belt land and outside the confines of West Malling and would lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The traffic which would be associated with any development of this site is likely to add even more stress to the difficult junction of West Street and the High Street.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59714</p> <p>I believe this site should not go forward in the Local Plan. It is on Green Belt land and outside the confines of West Malling. Any development of this site would cause harm to the setting of, and views into, the associated Conservation Area. Additionally it would cause harm to the setting of Douces Manor and St Mary's Church. The agricultural land of this site is a valuable resource which would be lost for ever if developed. The traffic which would be associated with any development of this site is likely to add even more stress to the difficult junction of West Street and the High Street.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59714</p> <p>this site is prime farmland and developing it would mean it's loss and a negative impact on the environment</p> <p>developing this area would have a negative impact on the character of the area.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59716</p> <p>Site 59645</p> <p>I believe this site should not go forward in the Local Plan. It is on Green Belt land and outside the confines of West Malling. Any development of this site would cause harm to the setting of, and views into, the associated Conservation Area. Additionally it would cause harm to the setting of Douces Manor and St Mary's Church. The agricultural land of this site is a valuable resource which would be lost for ever if developed.</p> <p>The traffic which would be associated with any development of this site is likely to add even more stress to the difficult junction of West Street and the High Street.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59716</p> <p>This site is adjacent to St Leonards Tower which is the oldest part of West Malling and a vital part of English Heritage. Developing this sensitive area would have a negative impact on the character of the area.</p> <p>This beautiful countryside would be lost and would have a negative impact on the ability for the local population to take/use the nearby footpath running past St Leonard's Tower whilst enjoying the harmony of the rural surroundings - developing this area completely changes the character of the surroundings and does not benefit the local population in any way.</p> <p>The extra traffic generated on the roads Offham and Teston would also add to the change of character of the area negatively.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59733. Kings Hill opposite The Crest</p> <p>Developing this land would create an urban corridor between St Leonard's and Kings Hill having a negative impact on the character of the area</p> <p>Nearby biodiversity sites would be impacted which is not acceptable</p> <p>This site is a long way from amenities and is not near any urban centre. Housing here would be lacking in any focal point/hub/heart. This would force occupants to drive. Local public transport connections is poor. Railway station is far</p>	Comment 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.
42833345	Annex 1	<p>Site 59789 should not be approved. The village of East Peckham already experiences a high amount of flooding. Extra houses right in the centre of the village will cause more surface water and cause flooding in current and new properties.</p> <p>The roads are not large enough for the extra amount of traffic, and the children walking to school will be less safe. The Primary School cannot cater for a large amount of extra children. The village does not have a GP surgery or train station.</p> <p>The site is not easily accessible.</p>	Comment noted. All forms of flooding will be considered within the Strategic Flood risk Assessment. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42833345	Annex 1	<p>Site 59806 should not be approved. The site is far too big for the area. There are no suitable services e.g. doctors and transport to support such a large residential site.</p> <p>Such a large site will send large amounts of water to the surrounding areas, areas which are already prone to flooding. By building a large site in this area you are causing flooding to many properties and businesses.</p> <p>The roads are small and can be classed as lanes, they would not appropriate for the large amount of traffic which would come from such a large residential site.</p> <p>The site will cover both agricultural and green belt land. Without agricultural land we will not be able to produce food. Green belt land needs to be protected.</p> <p>There are 2 important heritage assets on this site and an ancient pilgrimage trail. It would be immoral to destroy heritage sites.</p> <p>This site cannot reach the border of East Peckham. It would completely destroy the village.</p>	Comment noted. All forms of flooding will be considered within the Strategic Flood risk Assessment. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59807</p> <p>This site has been refused permission at appeal and should not be taken forward in the local plan process. TMBC has much information about the unsuitability of this site for development which I believe should be incorporated into the assessment process. Development would be detrimental to the setting both of West Mallig Abbey and Eden Farm Oast houses, the site is outside the confines of West Mallig being located in the countryside. Development would also lead to the irreversible loss of agricultural land.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59807</p> <p>This site has been refused planning permission very recently.</p> <p>It's very near the monastery which holds significant heritage and building on the pasture land would impact negatively and the surroundings</p> <p>Building near the station would create a community hub away from West Mallig and so create a satellite town adjacent to the station.</p> <p>This would destroy the nature of the village heart fragmenting the town</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42833345	Annex 1	<p>Site 59813 is not an appropriate site for more housing. The lane is already prone to flooding. Extra housing will cause even more surface water discharge and will cause flooding to current surrounding properties but also to the new homes.</p> <p>Extra traffic on the road is not safe for the children who attend East Peckham Primary School. The Primary School will not be able to cater for the large amounts of children who will move into the site.</p> <p>The village has no GP surgery and no train station. There are not suitable services to provide for a site of this size.</p>	Comment 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.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59814</p> <p>building on this site would mean the loss of designated open space</p> <p>the only access is from the A 228 - this would create a bottleneck in what is supposed to be a bypass</p>	Comment noted.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59814</p> <p>This site is next to Site 59807 which has been refused permission at appeal and many of the arguments for the refusal of the Gladman site are also applicable to this parcel of land. Overall I believe Site 59814 should not be taken forward in the local plan process. Development would be detrimental to the setting both of West Malling Abbey and Eden Farm Oast houses, the site is outside the confines of West Malling being located in the countryside. Development would also lead to the irreversible loss of agricultural land.</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833345	Annex 1	<p>Site 59837 should not be considered for development.</p> <p>There are already significant parking issues along this road. Extra houses will only worsen this problem.</p> <p>There is poor access to the site. The roads cannot support the large vehicles which will be needed to develop the site.</p> <p>The area regularly floods. The roads to the site flood. The new houses would flood and the current houses in the area would flood.</p> <p>The hamlet of Snoll Hatch is protected by policies to keep it separate from East Peckham. The area of Snoll Hatch is a character area, building new houses would destroy this.</p> <p>The village does not have the services to support this new development, No GP surgery and not enough transport links. The closed train station does not have parking.</p>	Comment noted. All forms of flooding will be considered within the Strategic Flood risk Assessment. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59854</p> <p>part of this land has recently been refused planning permission is is very close to the monastery - national heritage, important building</p> <p>building here is detrimental the the character of the area and would be a loss of open space to local residents.</p> <p>It is also prime agricultural land which would be lost</p>	Comment noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site 59860</p> <p>The majority of this site has already been refused permission for development on Appeal so I believe TMBC will be in possession of a large and credible body of information to exclude this site from going any further in the Local Plan process. Having said this, reasons for not putting this site forward include that fact that any development would harm the setting of West Malling Abbey, it would cause harm to the Conservation Area, it is in the countryside outside the confines of West Malling and any development would lead to the irreversible loss of agricultural land.</p>	Noted. comments on specific planning applications are Development Management matters. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site 59860</p> <p>This site has been refused planning permission very recently.</p> <p>It's very near the monastery which holds significant heritage and building on the pasture land would impact negatively and the surroundings</p> <p>Building near the station would create a community hub away from West Malling and so create a satellite town adjacent to the station.</p> <p>This would destroy the nature of the village heart fragmenting the town</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833345	Annex 1	<p>Site 59876 is a completely inappropriate site for planning and residential building.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch is a hamlet which is protected by a coalescence policy which says it must be kept separate from East Peckham. Snoll Hatch is a character area and new buildings will destroy the beauty of the area.</p> <p>The area is in flood zones 2 & 3 and regularly floods. New housing will cause more surface water discharge which will run into the current properties and cause financial damage. Snoll Hatch Road regularly floods, a new development here would be regularly cut off from the village.</p> <p>Snoll Hatch Road already has parking issues, which means the road is narrow and cars cannot pass adjacent to each other. More houses would mean more cars and this problem would worsen. Drivers already drive too fast down this road, so more houses = more cars = more fast drivers and this will make the road unsafe for children.</p> <p>There is barely any street lighting on this road, it is not designed to accommodate a large amount of houses and residents.</p> <p>The site is green belt land, this should be protected. The views would be destroyed. Building here would link Snoll Hatch to the main village so Snoll Hatch would no longer be a hamlet.</p> <p>The village of East Peckham does not have the services to support more residents. There is no GP surgery and limited transport links. The nearest station does not have parking.</p> <p>This site is highly inappropriate.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42793313	Annex 1	<p>Site Nos; 59635, 59637, 59638, 59647,59686, 59842, 59853</p> <p>The development of these sites will make Hadlow a satellite residential base for Tonbridge. There is no industry or economy in the area other than seasonal agriculture and the property values will be above those afforded by local residents. The infrastructure within the village is insufficient to support large scale development. Schools, medical facilities, roads are all oversubscribed already and there is congestion caused by extensive traffic on the A26 causing poor air quality for current residents, let alone future.</p> <p>the land surrounding Hadlow is good agricultural land used for crops, orchards grazing and vineyards, all necessary for increasing food production.</p> <p>loss of these green belt spaces will impact on current residents who enjoy them for health and well being. Many of the sites are susceptible to flooding given the nature of the surrounding terrain with rivers , streams and ponds. Increased development will raise the possibility of increased flooding throughout the village.</p> <p>We strongly object to any major development within and around the village of Hadlow on these grounds.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site number 59672</p> <p>this site off London Rd West Malling. The existing school does not have capacity to cope with extra housing here.</p> <p>This site is very near a wildlife and biodiversity site and would have a negative impact/disturbance upon it.</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.
42746017	Annex 1	<p>site number 59698</p> <p>this site off London Rd West Malling. The existing school does not have capacity to cope with extra housing here.</p> <p>This site is very near a wildlife and biodiversity site and would have a negative impact/disturbance upon it.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42784001	Annex 1	<p>Site numbers 59515 and 59516</p> <p>We live nearby to the above sites in the house my Grandfather lived before us since the 1970s. The land at the above sites has been continuously used by the local community since then - be it for the cubs as the closest outdoor open space; dog walkers (we see them every 15 mins passing through the green); church fetes and activities; and most importantly children playing. The site configuration provides a unique setting set back away from the road, where children can be given a slightly freer reign. The large woodland to the south provides older children the chance to get into the wild still within shouting distance of dwellings, There is nothing similar for thousands of occupants within such easy and manageable reach. Many flats which don't have the benefit of modern NPFA standards rely on this area for amenity space. The site is both surrounded and peppered with mature trees and dwellings at some points 2-3m from the boundary.</p> <p>The combination of constraints - the narrowness; proximity from existing dwellings; vast areas needed for tree protection (which could not be built upon); wildlife corridors (bats and dormice travel along the hedgerow around the site) would significantly constrain any development on there.</p> <p>The site was rightly allocated as a greenspace in TMBC's Managing Development and the Environment DPD 2010 - if anything use of the space with covid restrictions has increased and there seems no logical reason why it should be downgraded from its previous designation - if anything it should be protected.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph 99 states that;</p> <p>Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or * the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or * the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use. <p>None of these criteria would be achieved and therefore we believe the open space should be protected in accordance with the national guidance which is specifically material in this instance.</p> <p>Development of such sites will receive vigorous opposition as development, considering its historic use is wrong - contrary to policy; contrary to moral obligations to retain the few wildlife corridors that exist in our suburban areas; contrary to the health and wellbeing of local residents. The site is cherished by a vast mixed community, this includes people passionate about the location and an intellectually and financially affluent community -which will fight at all levels for protection of the space.</p> <p>We therefore raise our objection to allowing development on these sites and request that they are removed from the local plan as potential development sites and protected as key open space. We also request that such actions are thought through before being considered for allocation again (we have had covid where external close-by spaces were imperative; a cost of living crisis where people don't want to have to dip into their pockets to fight against allocations which really haven't been thought through) and an environmental crisis where we should be looking to protect and retain our green spaces.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42833281	Annex 1	<p>site ref 59613</p> <p>I like other locals are fully against the idea for this and the other sites. The results from such buildings/estates would be catastrophic for the surrounding area. the roads are already narrow and struggle with the volume of traffic. There is no doctors surgery and only 1 school. The land is also green belt and shouldn't be built on.</p> <p>But the biggest issue is due to the flooding in the area, the area already suffers and building on flood plains and fields that help prevent flooding are going to cause untold damage to surrounding houses.</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. All forms of flooding will be considered in the strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42833281	Annex 1	<p>site ref 59646</p> <p>building on this area will cause untold damage to the surrounding areas, the area suffers badly from flooding already and building here in the middle of the flood plains will cause so much damage to the wildlife and surrounding areas</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered in the strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42833281	Annex 1	<p>site ref 59837</p> <p>the proposed plans for this site are a truly horrendous idea. the village cant sustain new estates, the roads are narrow, there is no GP surgery, the site is green belt but the biggest issue is due to the flooding. the area already suffers badly from flooding and building on these fields will make this so much worse and cause so much damage to other houses</p> <p>building on this site is a truly horrendous idea and will cause so much turmoil</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. All forms of flooding will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42833281	Annex 1	<p>site ref 59876</p> <p>building on this site is an awful idea. the area cannot support such building/estates. the area is green belt so shouldn't be built on.</p> <p>the village cant support this as the roads are narrow, construction vehicles would cause chaos. there is no gp surgery as it is let alone with however many more people living here.</p> <p>but the greatest issue is the one of flooding. the area already suffers from flooding and building on the surrounding fields will cause untold damage to surrounding houses and peoples lives.</p> <p>please don't build on these sites in and around East Peckham and ruin a wonderful area</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. All forms of flooding will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site Reference 59634</p> <p>Firstly it should be noted that only a small proportion of this site is actually 'brownfield' with the majority of the site having Ancient Woodland classification as confirmed by Natural England. At present the woodland setting this site helps maintain a clear demarcation between Kings Hill and Broadwater Farm.</p> <p>The proximity of the site to the narrow country lanes of Lavenders Road and Broadwater Road is concerning as both have Quiet Lane status and are incompletely unsuitable for any additional traffic flows.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
39036065	Annex 1	<p>Site reference 59698</p> <p>I believe there are many reasons for this site to be excluded from further consideration for inclusion in the Local Plan. It is situated within rolling countryside and any development would not only destroy the valuable visual amenity of the landscape it sits within, it would also lead to the irreversible loss of agricultural land and to harm to the setting of the area. Development would also contribute to settlement coalescence between East Malling, West Malling and the smaller local hamlet communities.</p> <p>Furthermore, the access to this site would need to be either via Broadwater Road, which is actually a single track country lane for most of its length or via East Malling village (which has traffic issues already due to volume of traffic and narrow carriageways) and then through Stickens Lane which is another country lane with Quiet Lane status and protections.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42821793	Annex 1	<p>Site59456</p> <p>This area is widely used as a recreational area as well as having a footpath leading from the Village to Lunsford Lane.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42440705	Annex 1	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A). The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) The importance of domestic food production has been highlighted by the recent food shortages cause by the war in Ukraine.</p> <p>4) Local food production is made more important by the effects of climate change.</p> <p>5) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>6) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>7) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>8) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>9) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>Dealing with each site in turn:</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59685 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE with MINOR POSITIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office, and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is in a rural setting, NOT on the edge of a settlement. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape when viewed from all sides. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Cuckoo Lane and the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. • The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59690 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. • Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane. Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59693 (Residential)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. • The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development would depend on this site highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59721 (Residential)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. Should be rated as neutral or negative. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this currently unfarmed land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are houses in close proximity to the site. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from this site has added to that from adjoining sites and previously caused serious flooding on the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and should be producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development would depend on this site highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59805 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. • Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical access to most parts of the site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane, Cuckoo Lane and the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. • The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59809 Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. • Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane. Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. We observe that grade 3A land is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Green Belt Land</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The Interim Sustainability Appraisal makes no reference to whether or not the sites are within the Green Belt. Paragraph 11(b) and footnote 7 of the NPPF 2021 indicate that sustainable development is development “that protects areas of particular importance”, which (according to footnote 7) includes designated Green Belts. Therefore, why does the Interim Sustainability Appraisal not state whether or not each site is within the Green Belt?</p> <p>**Without a proper evaluation of the sites in regard to their Green Belt function it is not possible for residents to consider the full merits of each site and top consider all their characteristics when they respond to the Regulation 18 consultation and before the Regulation 19 proposals emerge.</p> <p>It is also not made clear in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal that the NPPF guidance is that the assumption in the case of Green Belt is still inclined against development unless there are other exceptional circumstances and even if there is not a 5 year land supply.</p> <p>** Rather all other options should be considered first.</p> <p>Best Most Valuable Agricultural Land (BMV)</p> <p>There should be a clearer statement in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal against the development of (BMV). I.E. Grade 1. Grade 2 and Grade 3A DEFRA land classifications.</p> <p>** This protection must be increasingly relevant given the climate change imperatives, the prevailing world order and the economic necessity of food production at home.</p> <p>The suggestion that that Grade 1 and Grade 2 land is only important if it is 25% or less of the site area is a ridiculous statement and can be overcome by landowners banding together to create a larger site, It also excludes Grade 3A land which is also encapsulated in the definition of BMV Agricultural Land.</p> <p>** The Placemaker scoring system (as referenced in the Urban Capacity Study Environmental Layers List) shows that the presence of Grade 1 land leads to the site being clipped. The presence of grade 2 land leads to the deduction of varying balance points depending on the % of such land on a site.</p> <p>Site Specific Comments with regard to BMV</p> <p>SITE 59693: Grade 1 land makes up approximately 20% of the site and grades 1 and 2 together make up approximately 70%.</p> <p>SITE 59721: Grade 2 land makes up at least 50% of the site.</p> <p>SITE 59685: There is some Grade 1 land on the site and grades 1 and 2 make up approximately 25%.</p> <p>SITE 59805: I am very concerned that above sites have been amalgamated with the larger Grange Farm (59690) site to make 1 large site.</p> <p>**This has the effect of considerably diluting the % of grade 2 land on the combined site. I contend that “site” 59805 is not a true single site as it is bisected by a road. In theory the further enlarging of sites in this way to reduce the % of grade 2 land on them could enable all grade 2 land to be developed.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42834945	Annex 1	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A). The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) The importance of domestic food production has been highlighted by the recent food shortages cause by the war in Ukraine. 4) Local food production is made more important by the effects of climate change. 5) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 6) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 7) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 8) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 9) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 11) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. <p>Dealing with each site in turn:</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59685 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE with MINOR POSITIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office, and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is in a rural setting, NOT on the edge of a settlement. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape when viewed from all sides. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Cuckoo Lane and the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. • The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59690 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. • Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane. Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59693 (Residential)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. • The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development would depend on this site highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59721 (Residential)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. Should be rated as neutral or negative. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this currently unfarmed land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are houses in close proximity to the site. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from this site has added to that from adjoining sites and previously caused serious flooding on the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and should be producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development would depend on this site highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Site 59805 (Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. • Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical access to most parts of the site is NOT within 800m of an existing secondary or primary school. <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane, Cuckoo Lane and the A26 (Hadlow Road East). Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. • The site contains underground springs which regularly bubble-up in periods of prolonged rain, exacerbating the above effect. Corroborating photographic evidence can be supplied on request. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. I would observe that the grade 3A land found on this site is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59809 Mixed use)</p> <p>SA Objective 1: DISAGREE - Should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is NOT within 800m of existing healthcare facility. • Although public footpaths cross the site, development would destroy their value. <p>SA Objective 2: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 3: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 4: AGREE but should be MINOR POSITIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would depend highly on the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objective 5: DISAGREE - Should be rated as definite SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of this agricultural land WILL significantly diminish biodiversity. • This has been confirmed by a previous biological survey, registered with Kent and Medway Biological Records Office and indicating that a wide range of wildlife is dependent on the land and its surrounding hedgerows. <p>SA Objective 6: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site IS located next to existing housing of low density and with rural aspect. Development of this site will have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. <p>SA Objective 7: AGREE</p> <p>SA Objective 8: DISAGREE - Should be rated as SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water run-off from fields on this site has previously caused serious flooding on Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane. Loss of absorbent land will exacerbate this effect. <p>SA Objective 9: AGREE STRONGLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is wholly Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land and is productive farmland, producing crucial food products for the home market. We observe that grade 3A land is also classified as BMV. <p>SA Objective 10: DISAGREE - This should be rated as NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus services are inadequate for current needs and any development on this site would therefore require the use of personal motor transport for travel to work and to use local facilities. <p>SA Objectives 11,12,13: AGREE</p> <p>Green Belt Land</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The Interim Sustainability Appraisal makes no reference to whether or not the sites are within the Green Belt. Paragraph 11(b) and footnote 7 of the NPPF 2021 indicate that sustainable development is development “that protects areas of particular importance”, which (according to footnote 7) includes designated Green Belts. Therefore, why does the Interim Sustainability Appraisal not state whether or not each site is within the Green Belt?</p> <p>**Without a proper evaluation of the sites in regard to their Green Belt function it is not possible for residents to consider the full merits of each site and top consider all their characteristics when they respond to the Regulation 18 consultation and before the Regulation 19 proposals emerge.</p> <p>It is also not made clear in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal that the NPPF guidance is that the assumption in the case of Green Belt is still inclined against development unless there are other exceptional circumstances and even if there is not a 5 year land supply.</p> <p>** Rather all other options should be considered first.</p> <p>Best Most Valuable Agricultural Land (BMV)</p> <p>There should be a clearer statement in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal against the development of (BMV). I.E. Grade 1. Grade 2 and Grade 3A DEFRA land classifications.</p> <p>** This protection must be increasingly relevant given the climate change imperatives, the prevailing world order and the economic necessity of food production at home.</p> <p>The suggestion that that Grade 1 and Grade 2 land is only important if it is 25% or less of the site area is a ridiculous statement and can be overcome by landowners banding together to create a larger site, It also excludes Grade 3A land which is also encapsulated in the definition of BMV Agricultural Land.</p> <p>** The Placemaker scoring system (as referenced in the Urban Capacity Study Environmental Layers List) shows that the presence of Grade 1 land leads to the site being clipped. The presence of grade 2 land leads to the deduction of varying balance points depending on the % of such land on a site.</p> <p>Site Specific Comments with regard to BMV</p> <p>SITE 59693: Grade 1 land makes up approximately 20% of the site and grades 1 and 2 together make up approximately 70%.</p> <p>SITE 59721: Grade 2 land makes up at least 50% of the site.</p> <p>SITE 59685: There is some Grade 1 land on the site and grades 1 and 2 make up approximately 25%.</p> <p>SITE 59805: I am very concerned that above sites have been amalgamated with the larger Grange Farm (59690) site to make 1 large site.</p> <p>**This has the effect of considerably diluting the % of grade 2 land on the combined site. I contend that “site” 59805 is not a true single site as it is bisected by a road. In theory the further enlarging of sites in this way to reduce the % of grade 2 land on them could enable all grade 2 land to be developed.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42833345	Annex 1	<p>The plans for site 59646, Hop Farm land should not be approved because the area is a flood plain and is surrounded by numerous rivers, including the River Medway, the River Bourne and Alder stream. The area regularly floods currently, so adding buildings and houses will only make the flooding worse. These new houses will experience flood damage. It will also have an impact on the village of East Peckham as the water will be pushed into the village. East Peckham already experiences a high level of flooding and the village would not be able to cope with more. More flooding will cause detrimental economic devastation.</p> <p>There are not enough local facilities to support this development. There is no train station, and the closest one is small with limited parking. The local GP surgeries are already under pressure and adding this amount of extra houses will cause problems for not only the current residents but also the new residents at the new site.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this plan should not go ahead. It is an extraordinarily inappropriate site for new housing.</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. All forms of flooding will be considered in the strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42617505	Annex 1	<p>Site ID 59740</p> <p>Well you cannot be serious!</p> <p>This would decimate this entire area and add to the misery of residents living with the dreadful Ditton Edge Disaster.</p> <p>For so many reasons. Including.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A beautiful area that you will ruin. 2. Enjoyed by countless cyclists and walkers. 3. Will remove a very large area of grade A agricultural land. 4. Will remove a very large area of green space that separates West and East Malling from Kings Hill. 5. It has a roads infrastructure worse than what is about to descend on us all from Ditton Edge..... <p>I could go on and on here....this site cannot in all honesty be being considered as a development site can it?</p> <p>And finally---have you noticed that you are putting virtually ALL development in the north of the borough?</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42732929	Annex 1	<p>We would like to register our objection to the following sites; 59701 59834 59661</p> <p>As your own report highlights there are significant challenges developing any of these sites, in particular flood risk where sites 59834 & 59661 which are classed as valuable floodplain spend a good proportion of the year underwater as can be witnessed from various available aerial photos. These sites are also greenbelt, green spaces, full of trees (orchards & ancient woodland) which help counter the terrible environmental impact of the awful traffic on Hadlow Road/Cannon Lane/Vale Road. Traffic which would only be added to by any development in these areas on top of the severe challenges of accessibility for these sites.</p> <p>The impact culturally (particularly from sites 59701 & 59661) for Tonbridge would also be irreparable as a result of the spoiling of an ancient lane which holds several historically important sites and listed buildings. As residents we believe that the Lane has contributed sufficiently already to the expansion of Tonbridge with the development of the Industrial Estate along the southern border of the lane to Vale Road. We would also like to note that the existing industrial estates have numerous unused/unlet units, so why the need to expand the commercial site into a currently productive apple orchard escapes us (site 59701). The Lane is also a well used footpath which is readily accessible for Tonbridge residents to escape the urban sphere quickly without having to drive and any further development on the Lane would only discourage its use.</p> <p>We would like to finish by acknowledging the need for development and growth for the area but think it would be beyond a shame to spoil a unique, loved and special part of Tonbridge & Malling.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59441]</p> <p>Kings Hill are concerned that additional traffic onto the A228 in the vicinity of the M20 roundabout would impact on traffic flows in the area causing problems for access to/from Kings Hill to the North.</p>	comment noted.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59442, 59443, 59445, 59456]</p> <p>Kings Hill have concerns that additional traffic onto the A228 in the vicinity of the M20 roundabout would impact on traffic flows in the area causing problems for access to/from Kings Hill to the North.</p>	Comment noted
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59447, 59488, 59594, 59602, 59603, 59619, 59620, 59621, 59622, 59645, 59699, 59714, 59716]</p> <p>West Malling is the primary local service centre, and is already at capacity with regards to parking, with frequently 'circling' the car park to get a space when it becomes available. Any significant number of additional dwellings in the area will result in overloading of the infrastructure at the centre of West Malling, making Kings Hill unsustainable if it cannot access an appropriate local service centre.</p>	Comment Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59448, 59449, 59450]</p> <p>Small site, no comment</p>	Comment noted.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59624, 59654, 59664, 59700, 59722, 59723, 59728, 59729]</p> <p>It is noted that, being in the green belt and without appropriate access to a service centre, these sites are NOT consistent with ANY of the spatial strategy options and should not be considered further</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59636]</p> <p>Travel to Kings Hill centre or West Malling village (assuming parking spaces are available) would result in a significant round-trip distance, so even though the site is physically next to built-up areas, it is not strategically connected to it, and nearby roads are designated as quiet lanes; development would impact on their intended use.</p>	Comment noted.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59658, 59672]</p> <p>The A20 is approaching (or, in some areas, exceeding) capacity. Adding further access roads is contrary to policy SQ8, especially given the closeness of other roads in the area, such as Town Hill to West Malling and the Birling Road, and the presence of Parkfoot garage nearby. The impact of such development could impact on the safety and throughput of the A20.</p>	Comment noted.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59673]</p> <p>Small site, no comment</p>	Comment noted.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59698, 59715, 59726]</p> <p>Travel to Kings Hill centre or West Malling village (assuming parking spaces are available) would result in a significant round-trip distance, so even though the site is physically close to built-up areas, it is not strategically connected to it, and nearby roads are designated as quiet lanes; development would impact on their intended use.</p>	Comment noted.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59733]</p> <p>Access to this Site would be via King Hill, at a junction close to a very busy roundabout. KHPC consider that this would impact on road throughput and safety, especially with cars coming off the roundabout at speed, having to stop for cars waiting to turn right into the proposed site.</p>	Comment noted.
44309601	Annex 1	<p>[59743, 59824]</p> <p>Travel to Kings Hill centre or West Malling village (assuming parking spaces are available) would result in a significant round-trip distance, so even though the site is physically close to built-up areas, it is not strategically connected to it, and nearby roads are designated as quiet lanes; development would impact on their intended use.</p>	Comment noted.
42781249	Annex 1	<p>Site 59488 High Street car park</p> <p>Residential</p> <p>High Street car park 16 houses</p> <p>my comments on the use of this site for house building are</p> <p>to maintain the economic viability of the town West Malling needs to retain all existing car park spaces. It has two little as it is with many people parking on double yellow lines. This will lead to indiscriminate parking on residential roads already overburdened. Loss of parking will be disastrous for the shops specially Tesco. Many older people live in the town centre and these shops and services are their lifeline. visitors will go elsewhere</p> <p>Ryarsh lane car park</p>	Comment Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>site 59447</p> <p>residential</p> <p>Ryarsh Lane car park 14 houses</p> <p>my comments on the use of this car park for housing are this car park provides the only dedicated parking for town business and retail premises. West Malling needs more parking space not less. Car parking is vital for the economic viability of the town. It has a number of restaurants and pubs which attract visitors and residents at all hours of the day. With little car parking pay spaces people are increasingly parking on double yellow lines and blocking roads. There is a long list of permits with many residents without car garage space. There is no alternative town centre site.</p> <p>St Leonard St site 59594 residential St. Leonards street 35 houses my comments on the use of this site for house building are:</p> <p>It's imperative to retain this green belt land and also it is partly within the conservation area. It will also lead to loss of agricultural land. It will be detrimental to the historical setting of St. Leonards tower and morning place. Access to the site to both St. Leonards street and Teston Road will be problematical as it is a busy area with teston road being especially in our land. The present access to part of the site is a narrow angled road onto St. Leonards street which is potentially dangerous and not in anyway suited to an increase in traffic.</p> <p>St. Leonards St the Crest site 59602 59603 mixed-use the Crest opposite Orwell spike mix use includes 19 houses</p> <p>my comments on the use of this site for house building are:</p> <p>I object to developing this green belt land and the loss of agricultural land. It will also increase the traffic in this area already more so because of the development opposite. It is near to a busy roundabout of which heavy lorries come and go to blaise farm quarry.</p> <p>Norman Road site 59619 residential Norman road 30 houses this site totally includes 59620 59621 and 59622</p> <p>My comments on the use of this site for house building are:</p> <p>This is green belt land and it has repeatedly been refused on appeal. It involves lots of agricultural land. There is a height restriction between Sandy Lane railway bridge. Fatherwell Rd has quite lane status and traffic is restricted on West Street. Norman road is very narrow at that point with focus and car sharing one lane.</p> <p>Site 59620 residential Norman road seven houses my comments on the use of this side for house building are the same as the above for Norman Road</p> <p>site 59621 59622 residential Norman road 20 house, 7 houses</p> <p>my comments for the use of this site for house building are the same as the above for Norman Road.</p> <p>Offham Road site 59645 residential Offham adjacent to number 139 42 houses</p> <p>Previously refused by tmhc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>My comments on the east of this site for house building are:</p> <p>This is protected green belt land it would also involve loss of agricultural land. It would cause harm to the setting and views in the conservation area. It would also cause harm to the setting of the locally historical duces manner and St Mary's Church. Traffic is restricted in the often road leading onto narrow West Street.</p> <p>Often Road</p> <p>site 59716 residential</p> <p>Offhamoften road to Malling place grounds 28 houses</p> <p>My comments on the use of this site for house building are:</p> <p>These sites are on protected green belt land and is in a conservation area. They should be granted permission we will lose precious agricultural land. It would cause harm to setting up St. Leonards tower an morning place. Access to the sites would present major traffic problems on to the narrowing road into the heart of West morning. Parking is already allowed on both sides of the road nearer to West St resulting in a single lane.</p> <p>Offham road Manor Farm</p> <p>site 59714 residential Manor Farm Offham Road 69 houses</p> <p>My comments on the use of this site for house building are: this is green belt land and this development would detract from visual amenity of the rural landscape. This is rural land in the conservation area. This would harm the setting and views of deuces manner in Saint Mary's church like a historical buildings. We would also suffer the loss of agricultural land to this beautiful rural landscape. Traffic would be on to the restricted often road and into last West Street and the restricted access to the High Street at the very narrow junction.</p> <p>London Road 59658 59670 residential</p> <p>London Road 19 houses 17 houses</p> <p>My comments on this of this site for house building are: this is a green belt site and should be protected. As there is already an improved application for a 79 bed care home I believe it would be an overdevelopment of this green belt side.</p> <p>Ofham/Ewell 59699</p> <p>site 59699 mixed-use Ewell Ave/Offham road mixed-use</p> <p>My comments on the use of this site for mixed-use housing and other uses are this is farmland in the green belt granting of planning permission would result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The traffic from this developed site with significant impact on the town as it would lead directly to join the often restricted off and West Street. Access might also be on to other smaller roads in the area IE father well road which will be dangerous as they are single lane and narrow. Drainage in this area I terrible with flooding frequently after rainfall.</p> <p>Station approach 59807 site 59807 residential station approach 34 houses</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>My comments on the use of this site for housing are:</p> <p>an appeal full this site was refused in 22 (gladman). Nothing has changed to make this site this make this a viable site. It was deemed detrimental to the setting of historical West Malling Abbey Eden from oast houses and West Malling station. It is also valuable agricultural land.</p> <p>Station approach Eden farm 59860 sites 59860 residential</p> <p>station road/ Eden farm lane 41 houses</p> <p>My comments on the use of this land for house building are:</p> <p>This would cause harm to the setting of Westmoreland Abbey a scheduled ancient monument. It would also cause harm to the setting of the conservation area and cause loss of valuable agricultural land. Access in and out of the site would also be on station approach which is one end joins Lucks Hill with the primary school directly opposite. It would cause traffic chaos leading directly to swan street and the High Street all on narrow roads.</p> <p>Bypass 59814 site 59814 59740 triangular failed off West Malling bypass my comments on the use of this land for housing or other uses. This site is very close to station approach access an early application which was rejected 59807. It is also detrimental to the setting of historical West Malling Abbey and station. It would entail a loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Broadwater farm 59740 site mix used Broadwater farm mix useful stop site of current planning application with area West of bypass removed. my comments on the use of this land for 900 houses are: land at significant harm for loss of conservation areas of new barns Broadwater farm and Mill Street. There would be harm to the aquifer for streams into word east Malling. It would cause harm to non listed heritage assets quiet lane and the road network. There would be need for two access roads through the countryside and it would entail significant loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Lux hill/station north 59854 residential Lucks Hill station North 20 houses</p> <p>My comments on the use of this land for house building are:</p> <p>This is opposite a rejected development. It was approved by tmhc for a car park which has now lapsed. And appeal is awaited up for on the refusal by tmhc for a care home. This development would cause harm to the setting of West Malling Abbey it is in the a conservation area and would entail loss of agricultural land. Lucks Hill narrows at this point and with a primary school opposite would cause major traffic disruption in the area and leading directly onto swan street and the nearby designated quiet lane.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42795681	Annex 1	<p>I submit that any appraisal of the Relevant Sites should take into account the following factors by reason of which they should not be included within the Local Plan as suitable for achievable development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * they are greenfield sites, wholly within the MGB and in open countryside and are essential to the intrinsic rural character of this part of West Malling; * the comprise agricultural land and/or pasture; * they are all close by and affect the setting of historic monuments and/or conservation areas; * they have high environmental importance to the sustainability of wild flowers and wildlife; * their have a central role in the character of West Malling and are important elements of the area's natural assets; * the restrictions on further development of Offham Road, and the fact that it has reached maximum capacity means that further development of land requiring access onto it in meaningful volumes will be unsustainable; and * that, based on the high level constraints affecting the surrounding road network, there is little or no likelihood of future infrastructure being able to support development; * other sites sharing similar considerations have been declared in the past, by the Council, to be unsuitable on grounds that apply equally to the Relevant Sites. 	Comment Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38330721	Annex 1	<p>I have been asked to write to you to express this Parish Council's concern that the Borough's consultants have put forward as possible housing sites land owned by the Borough Council without prior consultation with it.</p> <p>One example is a recreation area in Leybourne locally known as "the Bombhole", this area of land is leased to the parish council which would preclude from being used for housing. It is therefore not available and has created a furor in Leybourne and the parish council are at a loss as why this was not recognized at an early stage.</p> <p>It is understood that the consultants at this stage did not check on land ownership which is easily done by Land Registry searches with the records all on line and copies obtainable at a small fee. It is felt that this is unsatisfactory, and it has misled residents into what areas are seriously being considered.</p> <p>It is within the remit of the Borough Council to make an early decision as landowner that these sites are not available and Leybourne Parish Council would urge you to withdraw these sites as soon as possible so that the electorate can concentrate on the serious contenders.</p> <p>Proposed Areas in Leybourne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Site 59445 <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +Loss of trees in this area would be detrimental to the local environment. +Losing this area would cause a deficiency in social outside facilities for the local children. +The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban. +This land is currently leased to the parish council. * Site 59443 	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+It is situated on a flood plain.</p> <p>+Loss of trees in this area.</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>+This site is not suitable for development as it is the pathway of the high pressure aviation pipeline.</p> <p>* Site 59442</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+It is situated on a flood plain.</p> <p>+Loss of trees in this area would be detrimental.</p> <p>+Losing this area would cause a deficiency in social outside facilities for the local children.</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>* Site 59691</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+The area of land is next to a designated wildlife area with a view to making this area a nature reserve.</p> <p>+The loss of land will have a detrimental effect on the local habitats and there would be an unacceptable loss of woodland.</p> <p>+Traffic generation would not be acceptable to the local environment and the road access would be unacceptable.</p> <p>* Site 59432</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+It is situated on a flood plain.</p> <p>+Loss of trees in this area would be detrimental.</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>+Losing this area would cause a deficiency in recreational facilities for the local area.</p> <p>* Site 59441</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+It is situated on a flood plain – zone 2 and 3.</p> <p>+Loss of trees in this area and removal of green space would reduce biodiversity.</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>+This site is not suitable for development as it is the pathway of the high pressure aviation pipeline.</p> <p>+Losing this area would cause a deficiency in recreational facilities for the local area.</p> <p>+Development will increase traffic generation where there is not a suitable road infrastructure.</p> <p>* Site 59456</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+It is situated on a flood plain.</p> <p>+Highway/access issues.</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>+Losing this area would cause a deficiency in recreational facilities for the local area.</p> <p>+The development of this green would be overdevelopment (increase in density of housing) of the area and it is also known that there is a bat population here.</p> <p>* Site 59833</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+It is situated on Green Belt land.</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>+Highways/access issues – traffic congestion on a dual carriageway.</p> <p>* Site 59863</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>+Highways/access issues – traffic congestion.</p> <p>+Loss of trees which is a noise issue protecting residents from the noise of the M20</p> <p>+This site is not suitable for development as it is the pathway of the high pressure aviation pipeline.</p> <p>* Site 59844</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>+Highways/access issues – traffic congestion.</p> <p>+To prevent urban sprawl</p> <p>+There is a TPO in this area.</p> <p>*</p> <p>Site 59756</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>+Highways/access issues – traffic congestion.</p> <p>+To prevent urban sprawl</p> <p>*</p> <p>Site 59762</p> <p>LPC objects to this area of land being developed:</p> <p>+The capacity of local infrastructure cannot currently cope with the houses that are already built, i.e. South East still being on a hosepipe ban.</p> <p>+Highways/access issues – traffic congestion.</p> <p>+This is Green Belt Land.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42016897	Question 7	As I have said you have wiped out our communities we are not in Medway we are not a gap to be filled and as I have said ask the community about local services and that they are at breaking point now then you may review and have a development gap we simply cannot sustain current levels of development.	Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42021761	Question 7	Insufficient weight has been given to the effects on current population and existing infrastructure.	Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42044577	Question 7	I believe that TMBC is a unique area that requires its council to FIGHT on behalf of its residents to protect the land which attracted the residents in the first place. If development needs to occur do it in places where the existing footprint is ugly or poor and can be improved.	Comment noted.
42080737	Question 7	Honestly, it's a 273 page document... The fact that a potential 1,410 are being promoted for possible development between the rural communities of Burham and Wouldham is enough for me to see this document as flawed. Given that Peters Village has recently been built between the two, and another huge development planned for Eccles (with the traffic exiting via Burham), it would take this one document to be put forward to obliterated all the rural communities in this area in one planning move.	Comment Comment noted.All sites submitted to the council have been subject to sustainability appraisal. A decision on which sites to allocate for development has not yet been made, and will be informed by a range of pieces of evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42134817	Question 7	See answer to previous questions	Comment noted.
42166369	Question 7	I cannot agree to something that is extremely unclear, unnecessarily complicated and difficult to understand	Comment noted.
42167937	Question 7	These Sustainability Appraisal reports are flawed. See deficiencies in approval of Broadwater development.	Comment noted.
42180641	Question 7	Not qualified to disagree	Comment noted.
42192673	Question 7	Transport ie rail access is essential for any new development	Comment noted.
42229633	Question 7	I think you are obfuscating with the language in the plan , you are un democratically obscuring this, I found it all as clear as mud!	Comment noted.
42255873	Question 7	No to any new developments	Comment noted.
42035937	Question 7	No consideration has been given to the lack of infrastructure in certain areas.	Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
25045889	Question 7	Not sure what it means	Comment noted.
42213665	Question 7	I think that findings of the strategic policy options are sound and reasonable.	Support noted.
42328449	Question 7	I reject the premise that we need to meet the assessed housing need in the borough. Why is it necessary to provide housing for everyone who wants to live here? It is a beautiful part of the country, naturally many people will want to come. That doesn't mean we have to accommodate them.	Comment relating to housing figures Comment noted.The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42350689	Question 7	Hearing "need for more housing" but is it really necessary?	Comment relating to housing figures Comment noted.The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42373025	Question 7	I agree that we should first focus on existing urban areas and leave the small rural areas outside the scope of the plan	Support for Option 1 Comment noted.
42391041	Question 7	Quite simply the proposal for there to be 1400+ new homes around Burham means that the findings cannot be taken seriously.	Comment noted.
42393985	Question 7	Huge number of sites identified in areas with no transport links, insufficient roads and on sites of existing yielding farmland. Would look to expand adjacent to existing residential urban areas first	Comment noted.The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes and local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
25100225	Question 7	can't understand it	Comment noted.
42438369	Question 7	The sustainability findings are sound.	Support noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42439169	Question 7	This report is in depth and appears to cover all aspects of sustainability.n m	Support noted.
42423233	Question 7	Hoath Wood is designated as Brownfield, however much of this area is ancient woodland.	Comment noted.The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42461121	Question 7	Hard to agree when there are so many unknowns and TBCs.	Comment Comment noted.TBC's refer to the unknown split between housing and other landuses where sites have been promoted for a mix of uses.
42453697	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42107937	Question 7	No further comment.	Noted.
42471041	Question 7	I cannot find appendix B as. Therefore cannot agree with the findings.	Comment Comment noted.Appendix B forms an appendix to the Regulation 18 Local Plan.
42472993	Question 7	No response	Noted.
42457825	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
42325153	Question 7	Option 1 for the quantum And the answers to Question 1 above apply Supported by necessary improvements in infrastructure, new waste water treatment, new potable water supply, additional electricity generation and distribution, additional communications and telecom networks, improved gas supplies, as well as local highway improvements, and restructured bus services to provide communication and connectivity between villages and towns.	Support for Option 1 Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42469569	Question 7	please send me the findings of the strategic policy options of chapter 4 of the interim sustainability appraisal.	Comment noted.Chapter 4 can be found on page 79 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report which is available on the TMBC website.
42487233	Question 7	No response.	Noted.
42457057	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42443201	Question 7	Borough Green should be in 'other rural settlement', our road connections are not up to standard - where is the relief road, who will pay for its construction?	Comments regarding the settlement hierachy Comment noted.
42491169	Question 7	Undecided	Noted.
42430081	Question 7	What it fails to take account of is the already eroded services - just in my locality of West Malling we have one less Drs surgery - the land is now being developed for residential use and less public transport options - both for commuters - the Canon Street London services has been cancelled some years ago without any comparable replacement and buses to key country destinations run more infrequently than they ever have.	All reasonable alternative development site options have been appraised consistently, in accordance with the site assessment criteria contained within Appendix D of the Interim SA Report.
38756449	Question 7	The call for sites provided 291 sites, There does not need to be a 2nd call for sites and any sites in this should be ignored as they will not have the same input or consultation.	Comment noted.All reasonable alternative development site options submitted to the council have, or will be, appraised consistently in accordance with the site assessment criteria contained within Appendix D of the Interim SA Report and be subject to public consultation.
42496417	Question 7	Cannot make sense of it	Comment Comment noted.
42511361	Question 7	Options 2 - 5 should not be considered due to protection of the greenbelt and AONB. It is imperative that consultation with key services including KCC are fully documented, so that a co-ordinated approach to housing and infrastructure is delivered.	Support for Option 1 noted.
42514209	Question 7	Do not feel qualified to comment	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42520801	Question 7	<p>This is not a particularly user friendly document, especially for the older generation who live in villages and are trying to protect them!</p> <p>All residents near the proposed sites should have been written to!</p> <p>Villages and green belt land should NOT be touched!</p>	Comments on the distribution of development Comment noted.The Regulation 18 Local Plan, including Appendix B, was subject to a full public consultation and comments invited.
42514977	Question 7	The government requirement does not appear to take account of the nature of the TMBC area and should be challenged. A separate assessment should be made to determine what housing could be fitted in without violating green space and AONB areas.	Comment relating to housing figures Comment noted.The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
38330881	Question 7	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
42470753	Question 7	No response	Noted.
42479393	Question 7	No response	Noted.
42530881	Question 7	There are a number of inaccuracies due to lack of knowledge of previous use. I agree with some of the findings but not all	Comment Comment noted.Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
38372161	Question 7	<p>Kings Hill is at capacity at this time. and really TMBC should not be thinking of developing more dwellings on this already compacted site The call for sites has taken on board the few green sites within the whole of KH. KH can no longer be referred to as a village, that went by the board a number of years ago. We are a satellite urban town, with no decent supportive infrastructure. A Surgery which has upwards of 22,000 patients, which is untenable at any time. There are flats undergoing development as we speak on the business part, which is quite bizarre in my view. The proof of too many people moving to KH is the enormous number of vehicles going out of KH from 6.30am to late morning five days a week and the same on the return at the end of the working day.</p> <p>There is insufficient parking or inconsiderate lack of parking due to the developer choosing to install 1.5 car parking spaces for some of the dwellings, I have yet to find a 1/2 a car! Also, the use of tandem parking on KH together with car barns, which residents then put doors on them for storage space! is also not working. Parking on the road / roundabouts / restricted roads / cycle lanes is extremely common 7 days a week.</p> <p>Perhaps the people who put this information together should come and live on KH they would soon become disillusioned!</p>	Comment noted.The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42541281	Question 7	sites in Addington are not sustainable - everyone needs a car	Comment noted.
42544705	Question 7	I am not an expert and I do not wish to comment on whether or not the findings are correct however what I cannot understand is why Eccles is being allocated such a large amount of development which is not proportionate with other areas. It has terrible transport links, a railway station which is not accessible easily by bus. It is a good half an hour walk away. The bus service was nearly stopped this year and is a very limited service. We have no medical services nearby, the medical centre will move to Wouldham, which will not be sufficient to cover so many surrounding villages,	Comment 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.
42440097	Question 7	Borough Green is not a rural service centre, it is a village.	Comments regarding the settlement hierarchy Comment noted.
42550785	Question 7	Infrastructure in Kings Hill / West Malling already seriously under developed and unable to cope with present demand. Adding yet more developments with limited / no improvements to infrastructure would be ludicrous.	Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42583457	Question 7	Because the sustainability will not be met	Noted.
42519201	Question 7	Yes in principal, but I do not believe the Borough Green and Long Mill area has sufficient infrastructure to support major development	Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42584737	Question 7	Development should be limited to brownfield sites in order to protect the green belt areas and should include improved infrastructure to cope with the increase in population.	Comments regarding the distribution of development Comment noted.
42584193	Question 7	development should be limited to brownfield sites in order to protect the green belt areas and should include improved infrastructure to cope with the increase in population.	Comments regarding the distribution of development Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42544513	Question 7	Kings Hill is at capacity now for the area and infrastructure (shops, transport (car, rail, bus), health, hospitality). The Call for Sites has subsumed the few green spaces in Kings Hill, no longer a village but a town. - The surgery has 22,00 patients. - Flats being built in the Business park. - Huge number of vehicles entering and exiting KH in the mornings and evenings. - Insufficient parking spaces for the vehicles that inhabit KH.	Comment noted.The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42586497	Question 7	It doesn't make sense	Comment noted.
42588385	Question 7	see reasons on question 6	Noted.
42589153	Question 7	Two many houses are built in Kingshill, it takes away the original idea of having this as a village to enjoy peace and quietness and with nature being close to home.	Comment Comment noted.
42589889	Question 7	I don't think there is enough evidence to prove that 839 houses are required every year until 2024.	Comment relating to housing figures Comment noted.The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42519585	Question 7	No Responses	Noted
42591265	Question 7	Na	Noted
42590145	Question 7	My view is that the areas within the urban developments should present sufficient options to fulfill the borough's requirements. It is unnecessary to encroach on any green belt land: not just for now but throughout the life of this plan for the benefit of our children.	Comments regarding the distribution of development Comment noted.
38882465	Question 7	With regards to Kings Hill CP11 deprecates any development outside of the community, CP12 constrains development around West Mallong and CP13 should be taken into account. Active travel does not work well in Kings Hill. There are incomplete cycle way and public footpaths which are often jointly used. Plans outlined in the Reg 18 suggest linkages would decrease and not improve.	Comments regarding development outside of existing settlement confined Comment Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42604353	Question 7	Using the M25 as a relief road is the best transport strategy - this can be done with a junction west bound of current junction 5. This would make traffic flow more efficiently which is less polluting and less of an issue on the small local roads. Regular and more frequent buses are needed but are less useful in the rural locale	Transport and infrastructure will be considered and reflected within the Transport Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan being prepared to support plan preparation.
38779009	Question 7	I would like guarantees that amenity land - playgrounds, greens, playing fields - is not designated for housing.	Comment noted.
38779009	Question 7	I would like guarantees that amenity land - playgrounds, greens, playing fields - is not designated for housing.	Comment noted.
42612225	Question 7	The assessment assumes that defined Urban Areas have the services and infrastructure to support further expansion - this is not the case, with road infrastructure and medical facilities already struggling to meet demand.	Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42614849	Question 7	I am not well informed enough to make a judgement	Comment noted.
42361889	Question 7	The principles make sense, however, the way they were assessed and the conclusions arrived at are not that clear.	Comment noted.
42506945	Question 7	The policy assessments are not sufficiently and carefully thought out.	Comment Comment noted.
42616033	Question 7	The Golf Course has been defined as a Local Wildlife Site as part of the nature conservation sites defined by the Environment Agency in their screening report for Nature and Heritage Conservation in 2019 and should therefore not be included in the call for site Kings Hill is over developed and an additional 1228 and 275 units south of Kings Hill is not sustainable, please refer to sites 59797 and 59800.	Comment noted.The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42442881	Question 7	The findings are factual but do not explore some of the underlying causes. For example people rely on cars in this area because public transport provision is appallingly unreliable and expensive compared to more urban areas. The bus times don't match up with the train timetable and this is a big commuter settlement. Cycle paths are great but won't change the % of people commuting to work by car significantly.	Support Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42646849	Question 7	Generally I do agree, however, I believe that where a development is approved that significantly detracts from the quiet enjoyment, beautiful views and value of an existing property, the developers must be legally bound to offer the residents substantial compensation and the opportunity to sell their property at market value plus a premium and have all moving costs covered. This will ensure developers properly consider the impact of what they want to do and give home owners protection and options should such a development take place.	Comment noted.
42388225	Question 7	Little mention of issues of climate change and the impact, thereto.	Comment Comment noted.Climate Change will be considered and reflected within the Climate Changeevidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42544353	Question 7	It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which may already be out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses. Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than send trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense.	Comment relating to housing figures Comment noted.The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42671521	Question 7	Protect the planet	Noted.
42672097	Question 7	no response	Noted.
42616225	Question 7	No response	Noted.
39049377	Question 7	No further comment	Noted.
42687457	Question 7	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense at all.	Comment noted.
42687265	Question 7	Ridiculous sites mentioned such as car parks and on our Parish owned green spaces important for our wellbeing	Comment Comment noted.The sites were identified through the Urban Capacity Study, the Call for Sites exercise or from unimplemented allocations in the adopted deveopment plan.
42353345	Question 7	I agree with Option 1 for the spatial option to avoid damage to ANOB and to create a coherent self-sustaining community in the north east of the borough. I agree with option 1 for Tonbridge. The town needs more people who live and shop in the centre. It needs social housing, not more 'executive developments' gobbling up the greenbelt and bringing people in who shop and seek their entertainment outside the town.	Support for Option 1 Comment noted.
42702593	Question 7	No response	Noted.
42466209	Question 7	I do agree with some parts, the air quality pressures for example, how new builds could overwhelm the current facilities, services and schools. However I don't believe that building more homes automatically means they become affordable. Most current houses here are outside of the many peoples price range and all new homes that have been built so far are priced far higher than the national average, I can't imagine the building companies will price them lower that what they could achieve for them. That makes no business sense and that's what they are at the end of the day, a business.	Comment noted.
42501633	Question 7	The Assessment assumes that defined development areas have the services and infrastructure to support further expansion. The West Malling and Kings Hill transport infrastructure (especially roads), and medical facilities are unable to support the existing number of residents and dwellings. Major expansion of North East of borough would cause coalescence of communities in direct contravention of the stated preferred strategy of the local plan.	Comments regarding the distribution of development Comment 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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		The options given for the Spatial and Quantum strategy are I believe flawed and need reconsideration. Future development should be more balanced across the borough and not focussed on major expansion of North East.	
42707873	Question 7	No. It makes no sense.	Comment noted.
42688225	Question 7	Option 1	Support for Option 1 noted.
42470209	Question 7	policy meets government needs	Comment noted.
42230369	Question 7	See my response to Q4 - the strategy needs additions and, because of that, corresponding additions to SAR are necessary.	Comment Comment noted.Uncertain of what SAR is.
42651777	Question 7	Yes, I agree with the findings of the quantum, spatial and Tonbridge options, and the options to prevent merging of settlements in the North-East of the Borough.	Support noted.
42715777	Question 7	It is based on historical data that needs to be challenged further.	Comment Comment noted.Currently available data sets have been used in the assessment.
42716321	Question 7	Please see comments above	Comment noted.
42716353	Question 7	Option 2 - Please see comments above	Comment Comment noted.
42696769	Question 7	The strategy must balance the need to maintain our beautiful country and the need to build housing and therefore should not look at rural locations for large housing estates !!	Comment noted.
42589057	Question 7	I agree up to a point, but feel Hadlow and other villages could lose their identity, if too many houses are built around them.	Comment noted.
42717505	Question 7	I do not wish to respond	Comment noted.
42718241	Question 7	I do not agree with any expansion of any property in West Peckham.	Comment noted.
42718785	Question 7	A lack of care and thought in this process means that time has been wasted in finding realistic places to build new housing. It is easy to look at a map or drive in the area and just identify areas of land for development without any thought for local context and issues. I have submitted specific objections for specific sites on a separate email.	Comment noted.
42718689	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42718689	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42718497	Question 7	I could not find chapter 4 in the report. We need to maintain green spaces in the Borough	Comment noted.Chapter 4 can be found on page 79 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report which is available on the TMBC website.
42720161	Question 7	I am of the opinion that the blunderbuss approach to identification of sites fails to address the issue. Whilst some of the sites are obvious in terms of the viability of the land, the resulting issues appear to have been overruled. I.e. Transport, road congestion, schooling, medicare. We are a rural community and building on any agricultural land should be seen as an anathema. Those amenity "greens" nest to prior developments and villages should be preserved. Using them will further ruin the signature of a rural, not town, environment.	Noted. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes and the local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42589089	Question 7	I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East and West Malling as it the land is Grade 2 agricultural land that is needed for food production and also serves as a natural break between villages thus keeping their identity/	Support noted.
42721953	Question 7	That's fine.	Support noted.
42721633	Question 7	See question 6	Comment noted.
42722305	Question 7	This question is beyond a resident's knowledge and ability and should not be used to disregard residents' knowledge of the character of their local environment and opinion on capacity of existing infrastructure and the ability of this infrastructure to accept new development.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42586177	Question 7	The assessment fairly summarises and ranks a complex series of issues. My only concern remains that adequate weighting should be given to the inadequacies of existing infrastructure to support community growth in less well developed areas.	Support noted.
42722945	Question 7	I have not read this	Comment noted.
42723393	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42493185	Question 7	<p>The determining factor for the siting and provision of new dwellings must be proximity of existing transport network and the hierarchy for development locations should reflect this.</p> <p>1. Intensification of development in established urban areas with rail stations... Medway gap ,Snodland , & Tonbridge . Comprehensive new development the centre along the High St, rethinking the retail environment and on railway land around the stations. A eastern bypass/ring road link is required to reduce through traffic.</p> <p>2. New development around ALL the rural railway hubs should be done , in particular at West Malling (include Kings Hill) & Hildenborough Stations, and Borough Green.....yes some loss of green space , but this harm is outweighed by the meeting the housing need in locations with cycle/pedestrian access to the rail network or direct access to motorways.</p> <p>3. Development in isolated rural settlements, distant from major transport hubs, must be limited, regardless of whether they are larger. Hadlow , East Peckham, or smaller villages , as non of these settlements have sufficient services to be self sustaining and all will just put more cars on the borough's roads with more bottlenecks & POLLUTION. Extended development of these rural settlements will further degrade the rural environment, reduce the agricultural & ecological potential of the borough and increase suburbanisation, with no compensating benefits.</p> <p>4. Other factors still to consider are water supplies / soil and surface drainage/ nature and wild life and phosphate planning etc..</p> <p>5. Involved in this LOCAL Plan must be Environment Agency/ Southern Water/ The Nature Recovery Network so we can establish are to be balanced in the plan and carried out before any approvals are made</p>	Comments on distribution of housing across the borough noted. Infrastructure demands and provision, as well as flooding and drainage, and biodiversity will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42721185	Question 7	There is insufficient evidence both in terms of use of the green belt and climate change. No comprehensive study has taken place across LPAs that impact on TMBC, until such extensive studies are commissioned and the results known and tested this is all premature	Green Belt and climate change will be considered and reflected within the Green Belt Study and Climate change being prepared to support plan preparation.
42589025	Question 7	<p>The house density in Kings Hill is already big. Very few lawn areas are left where people can relax in phase 2.</p> <p>Instead of digging out the rare lawn areas inside Kings Hill, the council should think of building new homes outside Kings Hill, for example the land between East Malling and Kings Hill or the land between Waterringbury and Kings Hill.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42587585	Question 7	There should have been consultation on the relevant aims and criteria for assessing sites and we don not agree with the current assessment criteria and their weighting let alone the individual assessment of the sites concerned.	Comment noted. The SA objectives and sub objectives for assessing sites were set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (January 2022). This was subject to consultation with the required consultation bodies including the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England.
42726849	Question 7	see response to Q2	Comment noted.
42653057	Question 7	N/A - I could not find / read this report.	Comment noted.
42499585	Question 7	No - Assessed Housing Need should be reduced by 50%. Already the county, some areas worse than others, struggle to supply water to households when we have a week or two of dry and hot weather. Climate change is going to intensify, increased housing stock is going to increase demand for water.	Comments suggesting a lower than OAN quantum noted.
42078145	Question 7	<p>option2 meeting assessed housing.</p> <p>Spatial Options 2 Makes best use of land while protecting green belt and AONB</p> <p>Future Development Of Tonbridge Option1 Make best use of land with minimal encroachment on green field sites</p>	Support for Option 2 noted. Support for Option 1 in Tonbridge noted.
42727777	Question 7	This strategy makes no sense at all.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42728897	Question 7	See below	Comment noted.
42587169	Question 7	The call for sites and subsequent assessment do not take into account any planning history of those sites. It feels too theoretical (and in the developers' interests) to maximise the number of plots on a site but no reference seems to be made to the planning history of a site where applications for much lower densities have not been approved. The strategic policy options seem to be flawed therefore.	All reasonable alternative development site options have been appraised consistently, in accordance with the site assessment criteria contained within Appendix D of the Interim SA Report.
42318689	Question 7	This illustrates just how much adverse effect development in T&M will now and for the duration of the plan, have on our natural environment. As I have previously mentioned T&M is a part of the commuter belt and we are continuously building properties which are purchased by London residents, moving to what they feel is a better environment & within easy reach of London for work. Question: - why should we suffer the adverse effects to our environment if the majority of homes we build particularly in rural areas (eg Peters Village) do not provide for our local population?	Comment noted.
42735937	Question 7	I do not totally agree with this.	Comment noted.
42489889	Question 7	I cannot agree to something that has not as yet been put out to the local representatives of the areas concerned.	Comment noted. All reasonable alternative development site options submitted to the council have, or will be, appraised consistently in accordance with the site assessment criteria contained within Appendix D of the Interim SA Report and be subject to public consultation.
42726913	Question 7	There should have been consultation on the relevant aims and criteria for assessing sites. I do not agree with the current assessment criteria.	The SA objectives and sub objectives for assessing sites were set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (January 2022). This was subject to consultation with the required consultation bodies including the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England.
42713697	Question 7	But the primary emphasis should be on the need to meet climate change targets and the role that new development plays in meeting those targets.	Comment noted.
42746113	Question 7	There is no consideration for existing residents here. The Leybourne doctors surgery is already over subscribed and no one can get through on the phone - I imagine this is similar to other doctors too. The green spaces are also well used and utilised in Leybourne village - there are so many dog owners for example who will have no where to walk them!	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.
42617505	Question 7	Tricky question. I think so.	Support noted.
42436577	Question 7	The assumptions made regarding the number of houses required relate to central government assessments which are deeply flawed and are due to be revisited. TMBC should be working with housing need figures which relate to homelessness and overcrowding within TMBC, not a figure conjured out of thin air.	Comment relating to housing figures noted.
42722081	Question 7	I do not think all of these have the same priority. I think preserving green belt, preserving the natural environment and reducing climate change are the most important.	Comment noted.
42720097	Question 7	I do dispute some of the findings of the report, however it would be useful if a summary could be provided which is less technical.	Comment noted.
42736577	Question 7	Yes broadly, although I do not agree that development cannot be focused on brownfield sites and that significant development will need to be focused on the green belt.	Comment noted.
42758785	Question 7	There seems to be no regard for open spaces in built up areas, no one should have to live in a urban area with no green spaces or indeed car parks (Martin Square !!)	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42747041	Question 7	See below.	Comment noted.
42765825	Question 7	I have not read this	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42107681	Question 7	<p>It is not right to base the Local Plan on meeting the housing needs target which is out of date. History locally shows that building more housing will lower the price of houses, more people will move here. Option 2 will mean land being removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Healthcare facilities may be built but paying for and attracting and housing staff is not. 10% higher numbers is problematic. It is already a big problem to get GP appointments for example.</p> <p>We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building more affordable rented homes.</p> <p>Previous policies have seen development in the town centre. The area around the Angel Centre and the centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There should be greater importance on keeping agricultural land and I am against development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>My biggest doubts are about sites proposed in Flood risk areas and although there are mitigating engineering solutions to some areas using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will worsen.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42752193	Question 7	I can only comment on a few of the sites (not the whole area) so I am focused only on 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804 and 59835. Whilst I understand that no decision has yet been made, knowledge of the local area suggests that some of these sites would be unsuitable and were previously ruled out in the previous consultation as not available for development. Some of these overlap and so it isn't obvious if there is any "joined-up" thinking going on here as there are various assessment outcomes which perhaps may need to be considered too. More in Question 8 below.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42754753	Question 7	TMBC needs to add concerns with regards to 'population transfer'. A large proportion of the houses developed within its borough are not 'affordable housing or social' and are promoted and sold by it's developers to outside interest. Since the covid pandemic of 2020, there has been a significant increase of population transfer from outside the borough (mainly London). With the current London transport links, TMBC borough is highly sought after area, which increases house prices, competition and reduction of available housing to the existing residents.	Comment noted.
42770017	Question 7	I mostly agree but reducing greenhouse emissions and improving adaptation to climate change to reduce its impact should be at the top of the list.	Comment noted.
42771937	Question 7	The infrastructure and school/medical facilities already struggle to cope with demand.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42772865	Question 7	TMBC needs to add concerns with regards to 'population transfer'. A large proportion of the houses developed within its borough are not 'affordable housing or social' and are promoted and sold by it's developers to outside interest. Since the covid pandemic of 2020, there has been a significant increase of population transfer from outside the borough (mainly London). With the current London transport links, TMBC borough is highly sought after area, which increases house prices, competition and reduction of available housing to the existing residents.	Comment noted.
42772897	Question 7	TMBC needs to add concerns with regards to 'population transfer'. A large proportion of the houses developed within its borough are not 'affordable housing or social' and are promoted and sold by it's developers to outside interest. Since the covid pandemic of 2020, there has been a significant increase of population transfer from outside the borough (mainly London). With the current London transport links, TMBC borough is highly sought after area, which increases house prices, competition and reduction of available housing to the existing residents.	Comment noted.
42771361	Question 7	The existing infrastructure, roads and facilities already struggle to cope with the existing number of houses and people. Further expansion of housing development in, and to the south of, Kings Hill will make the situation intolerable.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42773057	Question 7	I don't agree that building 10% more homes will have an impact on affordability and if anything will just encourage people from out of the area to move here rather than encourage existing residents - and the next generation - to stay.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42773473	Question 7	There is insufficient evidence based research to back up the Interim sustainability report, where are they? I would expect to see:- 1 - Independent Climate change evidence 2 - Comprehensive independent Green belt study detailing best & worst performing Green belt areas based on bio diversity criteria 3 - Strategic planning models linked to proposals that reduce Carbon footprints so you can select the most environmentally sustainable for the future.	The sustainability appraisal is an iterative process that is carried out throughout plan preparation. Climate change and Green belt will be considered and reflected within the Climate Change evidence and Green Belt Study being prepared to support plan preparation.
42746657	Question 7	It does not make sense to over deliver on a target based on old data The plan should be aiming to meet the needs of local people first not encouraging even more people to relocate here. Building an excess number of houses will not lower the cost it will just bring even more people into the area, to live but not necessarily work so not contribute to the local skill mix. Building to excess will result in the greenbelt being threatened The infrastructure in terms of the roads would also need to be considered, they would have to expand to meet the need of all the new residents and the scope for that is limited to non-existent, negatively impacting everyone via increased congestion and pollution. Schools and health services would also be impacted and there is evidence that both are already stretched Building more houses on flood risk areas does not make sense. Whilst there are ways of reducing the risk to the new builds via technology there is still a risk to surrounding existing buildings of increased frequency and severity of flooding	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42738689	Question 7	Living as I do next to a clear multiple natural spring I can say that the pressure on the water table of all this new development in the north Kings Hill area will further impact our water table. Since the river system is so extensive in other areas of the borough those should be looked at to put pressure on the water table without making things worse in the East Malling area.	Comment noted.
42438753	Question 7	The options set out in Appendix B utilises many green field sites in areas of outstanding natural beauty. These are the type of parasitical developments in areas which we have commented on earlier which would inevitably lead to considerable opposition from local residents. We feel strongly that the Spatial strategy option 2 has the most merit, and would recommend that you consider our conceptual recommendation of a "wellness" development near Kings Hill which would benefit rather than damage the local community.	Support for Option 2 noted. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42780929	Question 7	the findings make sense	Comment noted.
42661217	Question 7	Insufficient time fully to assess the report. My three main concerns are 1 to minimise the carbon footprint of development while maximising the carbon sequestration potential of the land, 2 to protect and improve biodiversity in the Borough, reducing light pollution and creating wildlife corridors, and 3 to improve food security in a country that currently imports 40% of its food	Comment noted. Climate change and biodiversity will be considered and reflected within the Climate change evidence and Green Infrastructure Strategy being prepared to support plan preparation.
42715681	Question 7	Broadly agree	Support noted.
42774817	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42774849	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42788801	Question 7	Not enough information re wildlife impacts/biodiversity.	Comment noted. Biodiversity will be considered and reflected within the Green Infrastructure Strategy being prepared to support plan preparation.
42780449	Question 7	See above. Housing targets, I believe, are not driven by the correct priorities. It is also a fallacy that the market response to more homes is as simple as indicated. The issues facing housing & healthcare are national beyond facilities and I don't believe education support is adequately considered for the quantity of growth. If you wish to see successful growth, the growth must enable people to minimise their use of the overburdened road system (hence local business development, cycle lanes etc). Also as mentioned above, we already have considerable issues with flooding and drought, so developing flood plain land is frankly ridiculous.	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42784417	Question 7	The policy takes no account of the land uses, and the resultant impact of the loss of these land use. The climatic and rural impacts of the loss of these sites have not been listed.	Comment noted.
42722337	Question 7	Priority should be given to policies that prevent the merging of settlements in the North East of the Borough.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42613473	Question 7	59808 - This site is a greenfield site and in regards to your policy it states that it should not be developed on except in Exceptional Circumstances. Given that there are a number of other options available to develop, under your conditions, 'exceptional circumstances' cannot be met.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42790529	Question 7	no	Comment noted.
42533729	Question 7	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
42792769	Question 7	Don't understand it!	Comment noted.
42794625	Question 7	Inclusive and comprehensive	Support noted.
42795041	Question 7	Haven't had opportunity to read this (working parent) but I hope this does not exclude my opinions from being heard.	Comment noted.
42799649	Question 7	I'm afraid I don't understand the question.	Comment noted.
25400737	Question 7	Skip	Comment noted.
42720801	Question 7	I feel that TMBC should use already developed sites and develop those areas.	Comment noted.
42800097	Question 7	From what I have seen the policy has identified 'sites' which are publicly used green spaces and green field land, we should be protecting these areas rather than building on them!	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42792577	Question 7	I haven't had time to fully consider it, but it does look to be a balanced report looking at the complex issues involved.	Comment noted.
25407841	Question 7	Because I haven't navigated there yet and there is no hyper link to its location. I may come back and rewrite this answer.	Comment noted.
42800897	Question 7	The assessment assumes that the defined urban areas already have the services and infrastructure they need to support further expansion. West Malling and Kings Hill infrastructure: transport and medical facilities (for example) are unable to support the existing number of residents	Comment noted.The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42798817	Question 7	A key priority should be to develop and secure localised, carbon-neutral and sustainable energy sources which all households in the area can participate directly. This should include a variety of tools and sources, such as ground source heat pumps, air-based heat pumps, windmills, hydropower etc.	Comment noted.
25384001	Question 7	Answer: Broadly yes but the following two options should be No 1 and 2 and given significant weight. If the earth's climate continues in its erratic course then no one will be very much worried by the other options at that stage	Comment noted.
25408097	Question 7	Reducing carbon emissions should be the priority to reduce the harmful effects of climate change.	Comment noted.
42801281	Question 7	Can not make head nor tail of them	Comment noted.
42801729	Question 7	The findings are not clear	Comment noted.
42803201	Question 7	option 1 - I believe that development should be focussed on existing urban areas as these are already better served by public transport, better roads, access to facilities; shops, schools, GP surgeries, etc.	Support for Option 1 noted.
42803169	Question 7	Generally agree with findings and the options they favour. For 'Options to Prevent Merging of Settlements', under no circumstance should the economic growth and housing need override the purpose of that study in preserving the green spaces and settlement boundaries.	Support noted.
42805889	Question 7	See response to Q2	Comment noted.
42666881	Question 7	Do not feel sufficiently qualified to make a judgement on the technical process employed by professional consultants, set out over 27 pages	Comment noted.
42770945	Question 7	Housing assessments are completely wrong and will jeopardise our lifestyles	Comment noted.
42322369	Question 7	Because you have provided no link to this mysterious report... "Sustainability Appraisal - To view a map and how the sites have been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process, use the Site ID in the table below and cross-refer to the Interim SA Report, Chapter 5 and Annex 1." - Oh, of course, silly me, there it is. Do I agree? No, because it's "buzzword bingo", a meaningless salad of quasi-technical terms.	Comment noted.
42814881	Question 7	Very superficial and not particularly helpful.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38354465	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
25406913	Question 7	Whilst agreeing with the findings of SA, it must be recognised that this highly theoretical document.	Comment noted.
42801025	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42820385	Question 7	As above, see answer to Q4	Comment noted.
42801121	Question 7	No Response	Comment noted.
42768321	Question 7	I am not answering. Please explain what interim sustainability means.	Comment noted.
42823713	Question 7	It is not applicable to choosing which sites are chosen do tour question is not valid	Comment noted.
42616897	Question 7	Yes/No/Maybe ?? I support development on sites that are close to existing infrastructure, not in Greenbelt or AONB or rural areas.	Comment noted.
42801793	Question 7	Agree with Option 1 only	Support for Option 1 noted.
42376993	Question 7	<p>The strategic policy options set out at Chapter 4 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal report set out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantum options 2. Spatial options 3. Future development of Tonbridge options 4. Options to prevent merging of settlements in north-east of the borough <p>It isn't possible to answer yes or no to this question as it deals with four topic areas, with sub-options.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantum Options: WPC does not agree as stated in Q6. 2. Spacial Options: WPC refers you to our answer in Q4 3. Future Development in Tonbridge Options: WPC would optimise density to reduce the pressure to build in the Green Belt. 4. Prevention of settlement's merging: WPC would use 'Strategic Gap' policies and not make changes to existing Green Belt areas. 	Comment noted.
42829057	Question 7	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense.	Comment noted.
42806945	Question 7	This answer is not a rejection of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report. I am not commenting in detail to Questions 7 and 8 as I think my answers have been covered in my earlier responses	Comment noted.
42765665	Question 7	Not sure	Comment noted.
42807137	Question 7	This does not take work with the Sustainability report. Well-being is not being represented appropriately.	Comment noted.
42722625	Question 7	? doesn't make sense	Comment noted.
42802177	Question 7	Yes, broadly, although they are not easy to follow. Essentially the option for Tonbridge to optimise densities on development sites within Tonbridge, particularly on those sites within the town centre, maximising their potential (which would minimise the need for the release of green field sites beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, in the Green Belt, for development) seems the best.	Support for Tonbridge Option 1 noted.
38330337	Question 7	The findings do not make logical sense	Comment noted.
42413313	Question 7	The findings do not make logical sense	Comment noted.
42722881	Question 7	Mainly, I agree that developments in town centres should be more dense to protect the green belt.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772225	Question 7	<p>There is not enough importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Development negatively impacts biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	Comment noted. The council is aware of the importance of the best agricultural land classifications and the relevant considerations within the NPPF. Flooding and biodiversity will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Green Infrastructure Strategy.
42690401	Question 7	The document is incomprehensible. I can see no "findings" only "options".	Comment noted.
42795649	Question 7	Special attention needs to be made to the Options to Prevent Merging of Settlements in the North-East of the Borough. Only options 1 and 2 should be considered to prevent Kings Hill, West Malling and East Malling from merging, otherwise this will destroy the character of East Malling and West Malling and have a detrimental effect on heritage assets as well as destroying high grade agricultural land including orchards	Comments on preventing merging of settlements noted.
42814401	Question 7	The list of sites is so fundamentally flawed it shows a lack of adequate due diligence prior to consultation. In most walks of life if something was presented with such errors it would be cast back and told to be checked and re-presented rather than continuing.	Comment noted.
42822209	Question 7	I don't know where these possible future development sites came from but they clearly represent areas that should be never be considered as development locations.	Comments noted. The sites were identified through the Urban Capacity Study, the Call for Sites exercise or from unimplemented allocations in the adopted development plan.
42662465	Question 7	- yes, SA supports option 1	Support for Option 1 noted.
42754337	Question 7	I favour the anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy – Option 2. But the same policies should also be applied in the south of the borough to prevent Hildenborough merging with Tonbridge!	Support for anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy – Option 2 noted.
42794529	Question 7	I don't understand it	Comment noted.
42833985	Question 7	Green belt should be protected at all costs	Comment noted.
42724257	Question 7	Would need more info to comment	Comment noted.
42830913	Question 7	More houses and more people are not sustainable.	Comment noted.
42781825	Question 7	I do not know	Comment noted.
42803713	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42804513	Question 7	Yes, I agree that Options 1 and 2 are the most sustainable options, minimising the need for new roads or car journeys, and preserving the Green Belt, AONBs and agricultural land, and the character of local villages.	Support for Options 1 and 2 noted.
42833505	Question 7	It Is unreasonable to over deliver and base Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date.	Comment related to housing figures noted.
42834145	Question 7	It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over capacity.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42361345	Question 7	<p>In general there is a need to preserve agricultural land wherever possible (not just Grades 1 and 2 which should be sacrosanct) . This is key to ensuring food security, employment opportunities within farming communities and their supporting businesses and supply chains. Also to provide 'nature based recovery' - tree planting and set aside schemes to enable recovery of essential biodiversity. Crops for energy supply purposes and energy security via appropriate infrastructure (eg solar panels) where appropriate.</p> <p>As such, believing it is paramount to preserve our best agricultural land, we support Option One in respect of land between West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill. Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land forms a substantial part of this area and its loss will be an irreversible tragedy. We prefer that the edge of the outer Green Belt be extended eastwards from the A228 to the north- south road between Larkfield and Watlingtonbury. (from New Road to Red Hill). We strongly support West Malling and East Malling Parish Councils with this issue.</p>	Comment noted. Support for area beyond the outer Green belt boundary Option 1 noted.
42808033	Question 7	<p>1. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of removal of land from the Green belt</p> <p>2. Healthcare facilities are already stretched in Primary and Secondary care.</p>	Comment noted.
42835073	Question 7	<p>As above - question 6.</p> <p>In addition to the need to consider the existing population transfer in Hildenborough for example from London there also needs to be consideration of the fact that as a highly sort after location due to its position, village status and open green spaces, an increase in the number of buildings will not necessarily meet the housing needs of the borough but will in fact just draw more people to relocate here from London boroughs which in turn will increase house prices, not lower them to make them more affordable.</p>	Comment noted.
43072865	Question 7	Yes, the S.A. finds that Options 2 or 3 are the most sustainable options. This accords with Invicta Planning's response to Question [4].	Support noted.
43472865	Question 7	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
43598241	Question 7	<p>This would have multiple negative impact on the environment surrounding the area we live in by damaging natural habitats and eco systems. Pollution would also increase as residential areas expand which would impact all residents, including children.</p> <p>The infrastructure to support residential expansion doesn't exist. The schools are already over subscribed by current residents, as are the GP surgeries, dentists and so on.</p> <p>Continued proposed expansion of residential properties in this part of Kent is disproportionate to the rest of the county, this cannot continue without challenge.</p>	Comment noted.
43485857	Question 7	Support policy options that would protect the existing green spaces of West Malling and elsewhere in the borough.	Comment noted.
44695393	Question 7	No - Cannot make any sense of it.	Comment noted.
25259649	Question 7	The policy is a one track train of thought, just build on the Green Belt!	Comment noted.
44953857	Question 7	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
44954561	Question 7	No - Do not understand it	Comment noted.
42781249	Question 7	It is extremely important we preserve our grade one and grade two agricultural land so I support option one or option 2	Support for Option1 or Option 2 noted.
42719585	Question 7	Kings Hill already has its own problems. Off street parking, general parking and some of the narrow roads, mews and road features already create issues for general driving let alone for refuse collections, delivery vehicles and, of course, emergency vehicles. Currently in play are some very draconian measures to supposedly assist with these issues by adding a ridiculous amount of parking restrictions, using double yellow lines to many roads making the parking problem even worse. These plans have been 'pushed through' by TMBC in a very underhand manner with little/no consultation of the residents with the vast majority strongly against these plans. And now it is being suggested that cramming more housing in to an already congested area is a good idea!	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42729441	Question 7	As mentioned before the existing developed Kings Hill should not be added to, it has not enough green space, it was planned and accepted as is, its facilities are overrun and do not meet current capacity requirements. The golf course should not be touched, gives employment and recreational area and sold as part of the original plan which TMBC had major input to.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42469985	Question 7	No building on any green sites, just brown land should be considered. Why tear down further green land which will not benefit anyone except greedy councils and housing developers.	Comment noted.
45274337	Question 7	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense.	Comment noted.
45356801	Question 7	The assessment assumes that the urban areas and specifically Kings Hill has the services and infrastructure to support further development, the this is clearly not the case. Further development would result in individual communities becoming one amorphous entity.	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.
45361985	Question 7	Your planning assessment appears only to maximise. You do not adequately allow for economic and population factors.	Comment noted.
45369953	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it.	Comment noted.
25408289	Question 7	No – I Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
42798881	Question 7	Sustainability I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense in real terms at all.	Comment noted.
45469601	Question 7	No response	Comment noted.
42732193	Question 7	Sustainability I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense in real terms at all.	Comment noted.
45652801	Question 7	Services are already stretched eg Doctors/schools road infrastructure could not cope with more traffic.	Comment noted.
45672353	Question 7	Sustainability reports can be manipulated to promote favoured options.	Comment noted.
45716769	Question 7	It appears to have been written by somebody who is trying to confuse the lay person.	Comment noted.
38330721	Question 7	The infrastructure at the top of the settlement hierarchy is not sustainable and is at bursting point.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42224609	Question 7	I don't have time to read them all. Sorry.	Comment noted.
25063521	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
45811265	Question 7	!	Comment noted.
45821153	Question 7	NO I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense.	Comment noted.
42508833	Question 7	NO I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense.	Comment noted.
45825665	Question 7	No. It makes no sense.	Comment noted.
45825729	Question 7	I am registering my support for policy options which would prevent the joining together of East Malling, West Malling & Kings Hill into one big town with hardly any green space. I support options that protects the high grade agricultural land of Broadwater and Eden Farms. I am challenging the 30% increase TMBC's housing allocation from 56,096 to 72,000+. I think this is unsustainable and that the distribution of any developments should be spread evenly across the Borough.	Support for anti-coalescence noted. Comment relating to housing numbers and distribution noted, however the target for new homes over the plan period is 15,941 not 56,096-72,000+.
45811329	Question 7	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
25066369	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
25053249	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
45859137	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
45859969	Question 7	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense at all.	Comment noted.
45876449	Question 7	It is not clear	Comment noted.
45877569	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
45879009	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
38606561	Question 7	I don't understand this question so cannot respond to what I do not understand	Comment noted.
46004001	Question 7	No. Did not understand.	Comment noted.
42832641	Question 7	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense.	Comment noted.
42722081	Question 7	I do not think all of these have the same priority. I think preserving green belt, preserving the natural environment and reducing climate change are the most important.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25045889	Question 7	Not sure what it means	Comment noted.
25100225	Question 7	can't understand it	Comment noted.
25128321	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and they are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2.</p> <p>We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, Fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impacts on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled buildings in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf, which acknowledge the towns history.</p> <p>It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land in SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services. We have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in South West Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25310017	Question 7	<p>The strategic policy options set out at Chapter 4 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal report set out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantum options 2. Spatial options 3. Future development of Tonbridge options 4. Options to prevent merging of settlements in north-east of the borough <p>It isn't possible to answer yes or no to this question as it deals with four topic areas, with sub-options.</p> <p>1. Our response to quantum options is set out above at question 6. That is, CPRE Kent would like to see a third option tested. One that doesn't meet the full housing requirement to reflect the fact that:</p> <p>(a) the standard methodology calculation is flawed – it creates a scenario that addresses housing demand, rather than need.</p> <p>(b) there is a question mark over the continued use of the standard method now that the government has stated it wants to move away from the culture of top-down housing targets</p> <p>(c) the housing requirement should be reduced – in accordance with paragraph 11(b) of the NPPF – to reflect the fact that the borough is enhanced by having land designated as green belt and AONB.</p> <p>The SA confirms that of the two quantum options meeting assessed need (only) performs best in term of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>2. In terms of spatial options our comments are as set out in response to question 4 above. That is, of the options proposed CPRE Kent prefers Option 4. However, we would like to see a sixth option being explored, of not meeting the full housing requirement to reflect the fact that:</p> <p>(a) the standard methodology calculation is flawed – it creates a scenario that addresses housing demand, rather than need</p> <p>(b) there is a question mark over the continued use of the standard method now that the government has stated that it wants to move away from the culture of top-down housing targets</p> <p>(c) the housing requirement should be reduced – in accordance with paragraph 11(b) of the NPPF – to reflect the fact that the borough has the enhanced status of having land designated as green belt and AONB</p> <p>It is clear from the SA that option 5 (new settlement) does not perform as well as options 1-3.</p> <p>3. In terms of the two future development of Tonbridge options – (1) optimise density or (2) to apply conservative densities to minimise the intensification of the built-up areas, this would increase the need for the release of green field sites at and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, in the green belt, for development – CPRE would prefer to see density optimised to reduce the need for the release of green belt</p> <p>It is clear from the SA that optimising densities performs better against the sustainability objectives than a conservative application of density.</p> <p>4. In terms of the options to prevent merging of settlements in north-east of the borough by – (1) extending outer edge green belt (2) applying a strategy gap policy, or (3) having no change to green belt and no strategic gap policy – CPRE Kent would prefer option 2. This view is supported by the SA.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. Support for Option 4 noted.
25407841	Question 7	<p>Because I haven't navigated there yet and there is no hyper link to its location.</p> <p>I may come back and rewrite this answer.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38330337	Question 7	The findings do not make logical sense	Comment noted.
38330881	Question 7	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
38372161	Question 7	Kings Hill is at capacity at this time. and really TMBC should not be thinking of developing more dwellings on this already compacted site The call for sites has taken on board the few green sites within the whole of KH. KH can no longer be referred to as a village, that went by the board a number of years ago. We are a satellite urban town, with no decent supportive infrastructure. A Surgery which has upwards of 22,000 patients, which is untenable at any time. There are flats undergoing development as we speak on the business part, which is quite bizarre in my view. The proof of too many people moving to KH is the enormous number of vehicles going out of KH from 6.30am to late morning five days a week and the same on the return at the end of the working day. There is insufficient parking or inconsiderate lack of parking due to the developer choosing to install 1.5 car parking spaces for some of the dwellings, I have yet to find a 1/2 a car! Also, the use of tandem parking on KH together with car barns, which residents then put doors on them for storage space! is also not working. Parking on the road / roundabouts / restricted roads / cycle lanes is extremely common 7 days a week. Perhaps the people who put this information together should come and live on KH they would soon become disillusioned!	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38468641	Question 7	I refuse to agree to reports and appendicies that have been made so complex to understand that you either need to seek professional advice or just blindly agree with teh desired council viewpoint. I can't help feel this document is less a fair consultation but more an exercise in box ticking that will be largely ignored in the decision making process.	Comment noted.
38606561	Question 7	I don't understand this question so cannot respond to what I do not understand	Comment noted.
38618241	Question 7	on the final consideration (preventing merging of areas) I think the benefit of the greenbelt has been given too much weight. The existence of the greenbelt is why we have a housing supply issue in the first place. I agree though with the options for Tonbridge section - non-car options to the outer reaches of the town are currently atrocious - both on cost and ease. If this is improved then expanding the boundaries of the town might give more people the opportunity to enjoy extra space, garden, etc. rather than having a cramped new build flat but until that time expanding within the town will be the best way to avoid increasing the traffic problem and supporting the environment.	Comment noted.
38779009	Question 7	I would like guarantees that amenity land - playgrounds, greens, playing fields - is not designated for housing.	Noted. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38882465	Question 7	With regards to Kings Hill CP11 deprecates any development outside of the community, CP12 constrains development around West Malling and CP13 should be taken into account. Active travel does not work well in Kings Hill. There are incomplete cycle way and public footpaths which are often jointly used. Plans outlined in the Reg 18 suggest linkages would decrease and not improve.	Comments regarding development outside of existing settlement confined noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42016897	Question 7	As I have said you have wiped out our communities we are not in Medway we are not a gap to be filled and as I have said ask the community about local services and that they are at breaking point now then you may review and have a development gap we simply cannot sustain current levels of development.	Comment noted.
42021761	Question 7	Insufficient weight has been given to the effects on current population and existing infrastructure.	Comment noted.
42035937	Question 7	No consideration has been given to the lack of infrastructure in certain areas.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42044577	Question 7	I believe that TMBC is a unique area that requires its council to FIGHT on behalf of its residents to protect the land which attracted the residents in the first place. If development needs to occur do it in places where the existing footprint is ugly or poor and can be improved.	Comment noted.
42062017	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed. Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by deSning locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of To bridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42080737	Question 7	<p>Honestly, it's a 273 page document...</p> <p>The fact that a potential 1,410 are being promoted for possible development between the rural communities of Burham and Wouldham is enough for me to see this document as flawed.</p> <p>Given that Peters Village has recently been built between the two, and another huge development planned for Eccles (with the traffic exiting via Burham), it would take this one document to be put forward to obliterate all the rural communities in this area in one planning move.</p>	Comment noted.
42107681	Question 7	<p>It is not right to base the Local Plan on meeting the housing needs target which is out of date. History locally shows that building more housing will lower the price of houses, more people will move here. Option 2 will mean land being removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Healthcare facilities may be built but paying for and attracting and housing staff is not. 10% higher numbers is problematic. It is already a big problem to get GP appointments for example.</p> <p>We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building more affordable rented homes.</p> <p>Previous policies have seen development in the town centre. The area around the Angel Centre and the centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There should be greater importance on keeping agricultural land and I am against development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>My biggest doubts are about sites proposed in Flood risk areas and although there are mitigating engineering solutions to some areas using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will worsen.</p>	Comment noted. The council is aware of the importance of the best agricultural land classifications and the relevant considerations within the NPPF. Flooding will be considered and reflected within the new Strategic Flood Risk Assessment being prepared.
42134817	Question 7	See answer to previous questions	Comment noted.
42166369	Question 7	I cannot agree to something that is extremely unclear, unnecessarily complicated and difficult to understand	Comment noted.
42167937	Question 7	These Sustainability Appraisal reports are flawed. See deficiencies in approval of Broadwater development.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42171937	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas. It will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example that is constantly understaffed.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes.</p> <p>Social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so I oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the town's history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services. We have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. . 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.</p>
42192673	Question 7	Transport ie rail access is essential for any new development	Comment noted.
42197217	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. 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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42229633	Question 7	I think you are obfuscating with the language in the plan , you are un democratically obscuring this, I found it all as clear as mud!	Comment noted.
42230369	Question 7	See my response to Q4 - the strategy needs additions and, because of that, corresponding additions to SAR are necessary.	Comment noted. Uncertain of what SAR is.
42255873	Question 7	No to any new developments	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42322369	Question 7	<p>Because you have provided no link to this mysterious report...</p> <p>"Sustainability Appraisal - To view a map and how the sites have been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process, use the Site ID in the table below and cross-refer to the Interim SA Report, Chapter 5 and Annex 1." - Oh, of course, silly me, there it is.</p> <p>Do I agree? No, because it's "buzzword bingo", a meaningless salad of quasi-technical terms.</p>	Comment noted.
42328449	Question 7	I reject the premise that we need to meet the assessed housing need in the borough. Why is it necessary to provide housing for everyone who wants to live here? It is a beautiful part of the country, naturally many people will want to come. That doesn't mean we have to accommodate them.	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42350689	Question 7	Hearing "need for more housing" but is it really necessary?	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42361889	Question 7	The principles make sense, however, the way they were assessed and the conclusions arrived at are not that clear.	Comment noted.
42376993	Question 7	<p>The strategic policy options set out at Chapter 4 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal report set out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantum options 2. Spatial options 3. Future development of Tonbridge options 4. Options to prevent merging of settlements in north-east of the borough <p>It isn't possible to answer yes or no to this question as it deals with four topic areas, with sub-options.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantum Options: WPC does not agree as stated in Q6. 2. Spacial Options: WPC refers you to our answer in Q4 3. Future Development in Tonbridge Options: WPC would optimise density to reduce the pressure to build in the Green Belt. 4. Prevention of settlement's merging: WPC would use 'Strategic Gap' policies and not make changes to existing Green Belt areas. 	Comment noted.
42391041	Question 7	Quite simply the proposal for there to be 1400+ new homes around Burham means that the findings cannot be taken seriously.	Comment noted.
42393985	Question 7	Huge number of sites identified in areas with no transport links, insufficient roads and on sites of existing yielding farmland. Would look to expand adjacent to existing residential urban areas first	Comments on distribution of housing across the borough noted. Infrastructure demands and provision will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42413313	Question 7	The findings do not make logical sense	Comment noted.
42423233	Question 7	Hoath Wood is designated as Brownfield, however much of this area is ancient woodland.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42429089	Question 7	It seems to be myopically focussed on either disproportionately developing the North East of the Borough; or equally developing across the Borough. This is despite the NE of the Borough having significantly worse commuter links. Option 3 - no special protection would lead to significant harm to the character of the Weald and biological, natural and water resources.	Comment relating to distribution noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42430081	Question 7	What it fails to take account of is the already eroded services - just in my locality of West Malling we have one less Drs surgery - the land is now being developed for residential use and less public transport options - both for commuters - the Canon Street London services has been cancelled some years ago without any comparable replacement and buses to key country destinations run more infrequently than they ever have.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42436577	Question 7	The assumptions made regarding the number of houses required relate to central government assessments which are deeply flawed and are due to be revisited. TMBC should be working with housing need figures which relate to homelessness and overcrowding within TMBC, not a figure conjured out of thin air.	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42438753	Question 7	The options set out in Appendix B utilises many green field sites in areas of outstanding natural beauty. These are the type of parasitical developments in areas which we have commented on earlier which would inevitably lead to considerable opposition from local residents. We feel strongly that the Spatial strategy option 2 has the most merit, and would recommend that you consider our conceptual recommendation of a "wellness" development near Kings Hill which would benefit rather than damage the local community.	Support for Option 2 noted.
42440097	Question 7	Borough Green is not a rural service centre, it is a village.	Comments regarding the settlement hierachy noted.
42442561	Question 7	Assessment assumes that defined Urban Areas have the services and infrastructure to support further expansion.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42443201	Question 7	Borough Green should be in 'other rural settlement', our road connections are not up to standard - where is the relief road, who will pay for its construction?	Comments regarding the settlement hierachy noted.
42444129	Question 7	Not entirely- there are fewer health inequalities in these area in comparison to other parts of Kent. West Kent has a higher level of funding for areas such as mental health in comparison to areas such as East Kent which has a greater need and more long term health conditions as does Medway and North Kent. Some areas of the borough already suffer from high pollution such as at the Waterringbury crossroads. Further development and increased traffic will make this worse. There would need to be significant increases in the current infrastructure to cope with the proposed level of housing. For example, where would a new reservoir be built along with additional sewage treatment. The Kings Hill development was originally proposed as a business park and the high level of residential housing meant that an entirely new road had to be built, replacing a stretch of the A228. Not every road has the potential to be dual carriageway which will lead to extra congestion and air pollution. Loss of green belt will also reduce available land for people to take part in leisure activities and exercise. For example, some of the proposed sites will result in the loss of bridleways and foot paths. A large percentage of the population in the borough commute to London due to higher salaries available there. That creates an issue for local recruitment in sectors such as social care. Kent is a micro business economy with few larger employers, which is mainly in the public sector. Unless there is a drastic influx of large employers, it is difficult to see this changing. Kings Hill failed to attract a large number of companies to the area as has Ashford which for years was one of the key growth areas in Kent.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42447265	Question 7	These documents are extremely complex for laypersons to absorb and truly understand. It is clear though that you underestimate the positive effects of matters such as water features and resources.	Comment noted.
42457825	Question 7	Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
42461121	Question 7	Hard to agree when there are so many unknowns and TBCs.	Comment noted.
42469569	Question 7	please send me the findings of the strategic policy options of chapter 4 of the interim sustainability appraisal.	Comment noted.The appraisal of alternative options can be found in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal.
42471041	Question 7	I cannot find appendix B as. Therefore cannot agree with the findings.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42489889	Question 7	I cannot agree to something that has not as yet been put out to the local representatives of the areas concerned.	The Interim Sustainability Appraisal was subject to public consultation alongside the Regulation 18 Local Plan.
42491169	Question 7	Undecided	Comment noted.
42493185	Question 7	<p>The determining factor for the siting and provision of new dwellings must be proximity of existing transport network and the hierarchy for development locations should reflect this.</p> <p>1. Intensification of development in established urban areas with rail stations... Medway gap ,Snodland , & Tonbridge . Comprehensive new development the centre along the High St, rethinking the retail environment and on railway land around the stations. A eastern bypass/ring road link is required to reduce through traffic.</p> <p>2. New development around ALL the rural railway hubs should be done , in particular at West Malling (include Kings Hill) & Hildenborough Stations, and Borough Green.....yes some loss of green space , but this harm is outweighed by the meeting the housing need in locations with cycle/pedestrian access to the rail network or direct access to motorways.</p> <p>3. Development in isolated rural settlements, distant from major transport hubs, must be limited, regardless of whether they are larger. Hadlow , East Peckham, or smaller villages , as non of these settlements have sufficient services to be self sustaining and all will just put more cars on the borough's roads with more bottlenecks & POLLUTION. Extended development of these rural settlements will further degrade the rural environment, reduce the agricultural & ecological potential of the borough and increase suburbanisation, with no compensating benefits.</p> <p>4. Other factors still to consider are water supplies / soil and surface drainage/ nature and wild life and phosphate planning etc..</p> <p>5. Involved in this LOCAL Plan must be Environment Agency/ Southern Water/ The Nature Recovery Network so we can establish are to be balanced in the plan and carried out before any approvals are made</p>	Comments on distribution of housing across the borough noted. Infrastructure demands and provision, as well as flooding and drainage, and biodiversity will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42496417	Question 7	Cannot make sense of it	Comment noted.
42499585	Question 7	No - Assessed Housing Need should be reduced by 50%. Already the county, some areas worse than others, struggle to supply water to households when we have a week or two of dry and hot weather. Climate change is going to intensify, increased housing stock is going to increase demand for water.	Comments suggesting a lower than OAN quantum noted.
42501633	Question 7	<p>The Assessment assumes that defined development areas have the services and infrastructure to support further expansion. The West Malling and Kings Hill transport infrastructure (especially roads), and medical facilities are unable to support the existing number of residents and dwellings.</p> <p>Major expansion of North East of borough would cause coalescence of communities in direct contravention of the stated preferred strategy of the local plan.</p> <p>The options given for the Spatial and Quantum strategy are I believe flawed and need reconsideration. Future development should be more balanced across the borough and not focussed on major expansion of North East.</p>	Comments on distribution noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42506945	Question 7	The policy assessments are not sufficiently and carefully thought out.	Comment noted.
42511361	Question 7	<p>Options 2 - 5 should not be considered due to protection of the greenbelt and AONB.</p> <p>It is imperative that consultation with key services including KCC are fully documented, so that a co-ordinated approach to housing and infrastructure is delivered.</p>	Support for Option 1 noted. Infrastructure providers are engaged throughout the Local Plan process and a Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared to reflect the needs of the development strategy.
42514209	Question 7	Do not feel qualified to comment	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42514977	Question 7	The government requirement does not appear to take account of the nature of the TMBC area and should be challenged. A separate assessment should be made to determine what housing could be fitted in without violating green space and AONB areas.	Comment relating to housing numbers noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42520801	Question 7	This is not a particularly user friendly document, especially for the older generation who live in villages and are trying to protect them! All residents near the proposed sites should have been written to! Villages and green belt land should NOT be touched!	Comment noted.
42530881	Question 7	There are a number of inaccuracies due to lack of knowledge of previous use. I agree with some of the findings but not all	Comment noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
42533729	Question 7	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
42541281	Question 7	sites in Addington are not sustainable - everyone needs a car	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42544353	Question 7	It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which may already be out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses. Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than send trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense.	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42544513	Question 7	Kings Hill is at capacity now for the area and infrastructure (shops, transport (car, rail, bus), health, hospitality). The Call for Sites has subsumed the few green spaces in Kings Hill, no longer a village but a town. - The surgery has 22,00 patients. - Flats being built in the Business park. - Huge number of vehicles entering and exiting KH in the mornings and evenings. - Insufficient parking spaces for the vehicles that inhabit KH.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42544705	Question 7	I am not an expert and I do not wish to comment on whether or not the findings are correct however what I cannot understand is why Eccles is being allocated such a large amount of development which is not proportionate with other areas. It has terrible transport links, a railway station which is not accessible easily by bus. It is a good half an hour walk away. The bus service was nearly stopped this year and is a very limited service. We have no medical services nearby, the medical centre will move to Wouldham, which will not be sufficient to cover so many surrounding villages,	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.
42546721	Question 7	It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed. Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than send trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. 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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group</p> <p>Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by deSning locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the SVE Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order</p> <p>to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, TUF and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the Tash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the town's history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked</p> <p>by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42550785	Question 7	Infrastructure in Kings Hill / West Malling already seriously under developed and unable to cope with present demand. Adding yet more developments with limited / no improvements to infrastructure would be ludicrous.	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.
42562305	Question 7	Agree and disagree in some areas... (no button option) I am unsure as to how the housing requirement figure was reached. I disagree that more sustainable public transport alone will increase air quality. A junction at M25 Junction 5 west bound is crucial for getting through traffic out of smaller A and B roads and onto more efficient larger roads and motorways.	Comment noted.
42583457	Question 7	Because the sustainability will not be met	Comment noted.
42586497	Question 7	It doesn't make sense	Comment noted.
42587521	Question 7	It has not been approved by experienced and knowledgeable people	Comment noted.
42587585	Question 7	There should have been consultation on the relevant aims and criteria for assessing sites and we don not agree with the current assessment criteria and their weighting let alone the individual assessment of the sites concerned.	The SA objectives and sub objectives for assessing sites were set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (January 2022). This was subject to consultation with the required consultation bodies including the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England.
42588385	Question 7	see reasons on question 6	Comment noted.
42589025	Question 7	The house density in Kings Hill is already big. Very few lawn areas are left where people can relax in phase 2. Instead of digging out the rare lawn areas inside Kings Hill, the council should think of building new homes outside Kings Hill, for example the land between East Malling and Kings Hill or the land between Waterringbury and Kings Hill.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42589153	Question 7	Two many houses are built in Kingshill, it takes away the original idea of having this as a village to enjoy peace and quietness and with nature being close to home.	Comment noted.
42589889	Question 7	I don't think there is enough evidence to prove that 839 houses are required every year until 2024.	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42590145	Question 7	My view is that the areas within the urban developments should present sufficient options to fulfill the borough's requirements. It is unnecessary to encroach on any green belt land: not just for now but throughout the life of this plan for the benefit of our children.	Comments on distribution of development noted.
42604353	Question 7	Using the M25 as a relief road is the best transport strategy - this can be done with a junction west bound ot current junction 5. This would make traffic flow more efficiently which is less polluting and less of an issue on the small local roads. Regular and more frequent buses are needed but are less useful in the rural locale	Infrastructure demands and provision will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42612225	Question 7	The assessment assumes that defined Urban Areas have the services and infrastructure to support further expansion - this is not the case, with road infrastructure and medical facilities already struggling to meet demand.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42613473	Question 7	59808 - This site is a greenfield site and in regards to your policy it states that it should not be developed on except in Exceptional Circumstances. Given that there are a number of other options available to develop, under your conditions, 'exceptional circumstances' cannot be met.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42616033	Question 7	<p>The Golf Course has been defined as a Local Wildlife Site as part of the nature conservation sites defined by the Environment Agency in their screening report for Nature and Heritage Conservation in 2019 and should therefore not be included in the call for site</p> <p>Kings Hill is over developed and an additional 1228 and 275 units south of Kings Hill is not sustainable, please refer to sites 59797 and 59800.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42616257	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed. Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed. In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government. The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this. Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt. There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land. There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence. Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre. Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42616897	Question 7	Yes/No/Maybe ?? I support development on sites that are close to existing infrastructure, not in Greenbelt or AONB or rural areas.	Comments noetd.
42637441	Question 7	<p>It is unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the Borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the green belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to building the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on the green belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that bulindg 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen sunstantial developemtn in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the green belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future developemtn of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Road, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefrairs Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on green belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlookedby it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		As the reports sets out the imapct of development on the green belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42643873	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas. It will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example that is constantly understaffed.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government. The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2.</p> <p>We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes. Social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so I oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the town's history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services. We have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42652417	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than Snd trained medical staR who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staR are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the Flash Flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of Flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42660865	Question 7	<p>It is unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which I already believe is out of date and excessive. Furthermore, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas, it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical and para-medical staff to work in them.</p> <p>The evidence in the Borough is that there is already a struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 100 more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example - it is constantly understaffed.</p> <p>With regard to land where there are mineral deposits, especially where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have seven Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by the amount of housing</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>development being proposes let alone an added 10%. The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is also extremely dubious.. The Housing MarketDelivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that high quality social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option 1 is chosen, the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the Council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed in the Report on retaining agricultural land in order to facilitate food security for the UK (consider how the war in Ukraine is currently highlighting our need for this a country) and so I strongly oppose development on Grade1, 2 and 3 agricultural land.</p> <p>I also have huge reservations about sites in flood risk areas and although some architectural solutions may help limit damage from flooding, it is a major concern and not something I would wish on anyone. Modelling demonstrates that flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence as our temperature continue to rise.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future development of Tonbridge, development higher than five storeys is unacceptable. The architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Road, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf, which all acknowledge the town's history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In South West Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffc away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in South West Tonbridge would have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course it would negatively impact on biodiversity. The open aspect and character of the landscape would also be hugely adversely affected</p> <p>As the report sets out, the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge would have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces. After all, the water has to go somewhere. I will never forget hearing from a former resident of Yalding the impact on her and her family of their village being sacrificed to save Tonbridge from flooding. Although they lived on higher ground, they experienced what happened when the barriers opened and water devastated the village below. Her young daughter was so traumatised they eventually moved.</p> <p>impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42661217	Question 7	<p>Insufficient time fully to assess the report. My three main concerns are 1 to minimise the carbon footprint of development while maximising the carbon sequestration potential of the land, 2 to protect and improve biodiversity in the Borough, reducing light pollution and creating wildlife corridors, and 3 to improve food security in a country that currently imports 40% of its food</p>	<p>Comment noted. Climate Change and Biodiversity will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42666881	Question 7	Do not feel sufficiently qualified to make a judgement on the technical process employed by professional consultants, set out over 27 pages	Comment noted.
42687265	Question 7	Ridiculous sites mentioned such as car parks and on our Parish owned green spaces important for our wellbeing	Comment noted.
42687425	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by ANY development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is any idea from cloud cuckoo land. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2.</p> <p>We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so I oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there unless rain water control and harvesting are prerequisites. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future development of Tonbridge, the architecture of any new development should be in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>on Medway Wharf Rd. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the green belt which of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity. At the moment Tonbridge is bounded by Upper Hayesden Lane and this boundary should be preserved so as to prevent Tonbridge spreading to Leigh & further.</p>	
42687457	Question 7	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense at all.	Comment noted.
42690401	Question 7	The document is incomprehensible. I can see no "findings" only "options".	Comment noted.
42696769	Question 7	The strategy must balance the need to maintain our beautiful country and the need to build housing and therefore should not look at rural locations for large housing estates !!	Comment noted.
42707873	Question 7	No. It makes no sense.	Comment noted.
42715777	Question 7	It is based on historical data that needs to be challenged further.	Comment noted. Currently available data sets have been used in the assessment.
42716321	Question 7	Please see comments above	Comment noted.
42718241	Question 7	I do not agree with any expansion of any property in West Peckham.	Comment noted.
42718497	Question 7	I could not find chapter 4 in the report. We need to maintain green spaces in the Borough	Comment noted. Chapter 4 begins on page 79 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report.
42718785	Question 7	A lack of care and thought in this process means that time has been wasted in finding realistic places to build new housing. It is easy to look at a map or drive in the area and just identify areas of land for development without any thought for local context and issues. I have submitted specific objections for specific sites on a separate email.	Comment noted.
42719585	Question 7	Kings Hill already has its own problems. Off street parking, general parking and some of the narrow roads, mews and road features already create issues for general driving let alone for refuse collections, delivery vehicles and, of course, emergency vehicles. Currently in play are some very draconian measures to supposedly assist with these issues by adding a ridiculous amount of parking restrictions, using double yellow lines to many roads making the parking problem even worse. These plans have been 'pushed through' by TMBC in a very underhand manner with little/no consultation of the residents with the vast majority strongly against these plans. And now it is being suggested that cramming more housing in to an already congested area is a good idea!	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42720161	Question 7	I am of the opinion that the blunderbuss approach to identification of sites fails to address the issue. Whilst some of the sites are obvious in terms of the viability of the land, the resulting issues appear to have been overruled. I.e. Transport, road congestion, schooling, medicare. We are a rural community and building on any agricultural land should be seen as an anathema. Those amenity "greens" next to prior developments and villages should be preserved. Using them will further ruin the signature of a rural, not town, environment.	Noted. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes and the local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721025	Question 7	<p>It is unreasonable to base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date, excessive and needs revising. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas. Moreover, it will simply stimulate increased demand and a greater volume of people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it should be recognised that whilst it is relatively easy to physically build new medical centres, it is another matter to identify, hire and retain the trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone another 10%. Trained medical staff are in huge demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example that is constantly understaffed. I am currently without a GP as I cannot register with one within walking distance of my home.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that significant damage will be caused by large scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions and roundabouts are already struggling as they operate beyond their anticipated capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense whatsoever. The evidence highlights the fact that we have seven Air Quality Management Areas, all of which are likely to be negatively impacted even further as a result of striving for a target 10% beyond that set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The notion that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is unfounded. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to concentrate our efforts on providing accommodation for those living locally and this can be achieved by building genuinely affordable rented homes and social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt. There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate the security of food supply for the UK in this report, so I therefore oppose the idea of developing on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are grave concerns regarding sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will doubtless occur and have an ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two alternatives given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than five storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the town's history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In South West Tonbridge, Higham Wood, around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, there are few alternatives to using cars to access services and therefore we have a</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of further development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in South West Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and negatively impacts biodiversity. Furthermore, the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out, the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, due to the fact that the water has to go somewhere.</p>	
42721345	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721505	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than and trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed .</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by dening locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on aRordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly aRordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this. Regarding the Sve Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have</p> <p>seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identiSel around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42721569	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than send trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by developing locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government. The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the Sve Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in Tonbridge risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, Tuvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on eRect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42722305	Question 7	This question is beyond a resident's knowledge and ability and should not be used to disregard residents' knowledge of the character of their local environment and opinion on capacity of existing infrastructure and the ability of this infrastructure to accept new development.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722625	Question 7	? doesn't make sense	Comment noted.
42723649	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to 'over deliver' and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target, which I believe is already out of date and excessive. In particular, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas - it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here from other more expensive areas such as Greater London rather than meeting demand from within the Borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them, especially after the impact of Brexit and COVID. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand, and West Malling Group Practice is a good example as they are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>It is nonsense to suggest that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for the hundreds of families living in unsuitable accommodation locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes. The best way to deliver this is via social housing for rent.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although I have selected Option One, the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the Council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt. Housing built in a sustainable location like this, that reduces the need for unnecessary car journeys, is essential.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so I oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>I have huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas, and although there are mitigating architectural / drainage solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have an ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there as trends over the past 5-10 years have shown. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected. As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42726849	Question 7	see response to Q2	Comment noted.
42726913	Question 7	There should have been consultation on the relevant aims and criteria for assessing sites. I do not agree with the current assessment criteria.	The SA objectives and sub objectives for assessing sites were set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (January 2022). This was subject to consultation with the required consultation bodies including the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England.
42727777	Question 7	This strategy makes no sense at all.	Comment noted.
42728897	Question 7	See below	Comments noted
42729441	Question 7	As mentioned before the existing developed Kings Hill should not be added to, it has not enough green space, it was planned and accepted as is, its facilities are overrun and do not meet current capacity requirements. The golf course should not be touched, gives employment and recreational area and sold as part of the original plan which TMBC had major input to.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42735937	Question 7	I do not totally agree with this.	Comment noted.
42738689	Question 7	Living as I do next to a clear multiple natural spring I can say that the pressure on the water table of all this new development in the north Kings Hill area will further impact our water table. Since the river system is so extensive in other areas of the borough those should be looked at to put pressure on the water table without making things worse in the East Malling area.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42745217	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than Snd trained medical staR who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staR are in great demand and West Malling Group</p> <p>Practice is a good example and are constantly understaRed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by deSning locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on aRordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly aRordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the Sve Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identiSed around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insuUcient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order</p> <p>to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in Tood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, Tuvial and surface water Tooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the Tash Tooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traUc system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traUc away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the eRects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental eRect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746113	Question 7	There is no consideration for existing residents here. The Leybourne doctors surgery is already over subscribed and no one can get through on the phone - I imagine this is similar to other doctors too. The green spaces are also well used and utilised in Leybourne village - there are so many dog owners for example who will have no where to walk them!	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.
42746657	Question 7	It does not make sense to over deliver on a target based on old data The plan should be aiming to meet the needs of local people first not encouraging even more people to relocate here. Building an excess number of houses will not lower the cost it will just bring even more people into the area, to live but not necessarily work so not contribute to the local skill mix. Building to excess will result in the greenbelt being threatened The infrastructure in terms of the roads would also need to be considered, they would have to expand to meet the need of all the new residents and the scope for that is limited to non-existent, negatively impacting everyone via increased congestion and pollution. Schools and health services would also be impacted and there is evidence that both are already stretched Building more houses on flood risk areas does not make sense. Whilst there are ways of reducing the risk to the new builds via technology there is still a risk to surrounding existing buildings of increased frequency and severity of flooding	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes and the local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42747041	Question 7	See below.	Comment noted.
42751009	Question 7	It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed. Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed. In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government. The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this. Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt. There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land. There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS,	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42752193	Question 7	I can only comment on a few of the sites (not the whole area) so I am focused only on 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804 and 59835. Whilst I understand that no decision has yet been made, knowledge of the local area suggests that some of these sites would be unsuitable and were previously ruled out in the previous consultation as not available for development. Some of these overlap and so it isn't obvious if there is any "joined-up" thinking going on here as there are various assessment outcomes which perhaps may need to be considered too. More in Question 8 below.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42758785	Question 7	There seems to be no regard for open spaces in built up areas, no one should have to live in a urban area with no green spaces or indeed car parks (Martin Square !!)	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42760065	Question 7	<p>Option 5</p> <p>This option encompasses an area largely devoid of services.</p> <p>It is an area of narrow country lanes, some sufficiently wide enough for only one vehicle.</p> <p>It is an area without mains drainage, and one that is difficult for rubbish collections with large vehicles.</p>	Comments noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42762977	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which I already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so I oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces. The water has to go somewhere!!!!</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42770945	Question 7	Housing assessments are completely wrong and will jeopardise our lifestyles	Comment noted.
42771361	Question 7	The existing infrastructure, roads and facilities already struggle to cope with the existing number of houses and people. Further expansion of housing development in, and to the south of, Kings Hill will make the situation intolerable.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42771457	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which I oppose.</p> <p>I work at Warders Medical Centre which, along with other GP practices in Tonbridge, is already struggling to meet demand despite a very committed team who are doing their best to meet the needs of the surrounding community. We do not have the capacity to extend services further but feel it is important to remain in a town center location which is easily accessible.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42771841	Question 7	<p>It is unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in Tood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42771937	Question 7	The infrastructure and school/medical facilities already struggle to cope with demand.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772193	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed. Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traUc system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772225	Question 7	<p>There is not enough importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Development negatively impacts biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is aware of the importance of the best agricultural land classifications and the relevant considerations within the NPPF. Flooding and biodiversity will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>
42772257	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772353	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive... there will be significantly less demand due to COVID and Brexit. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by designing locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordable for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. There is also a recession coming where prices will naturally correct and adjust downwards.</p> <p>We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt. By being central to the town this will also mean these homes are more sustainable as walking distance to shops and the local train stations</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings any. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traUc system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traUc away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the eRects of more development in the town centre.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally effected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42773793	Question 7	<p>It is unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than and trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt. There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water Tooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42773857	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than Snd trained medical staR who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defning locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42774913	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by deSning locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the Sve Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traUc system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42776129	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42780449	Question 7	<p>See above. Housing targets, I believe, are not driven by the correct priorities. It is also a fallacy that the market response to more homes is as simple as indicated. The issues facing housing & healthcare are national beyond facilities and I don't believe education support is adequately considered for the quantity of growth. If you wish to see successful growth, the growth must enable people to minimise their use of the overburdened road system (hence local business development, cycle lanes etc).</p> <p>Also as mentioned above, we already have considerable issues with flooding and drought, so developing flood plain land is frankly ridiculous.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42784001	Question 7	<p>It is unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42784417	Question 7	<p>The policy takes no account of the land uses, and the resultant impact of the loss of these land use. The climatic and rural impacts of the loss of these sites have not been listed.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42785025	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the Flash Flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42785409	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to base the Local Plan's assessed housing needs on out-of-date data. This will lead to over-delivery and waste.</p> <p>Building more housing to meet supposed demand will not lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas as it will simply stimulate more demand, encouraging higher prices.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% is unreasonable. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas that are likely to be negatively impacted even further.</p> <p>The importance of Kent's agricultural land needs to be further recognized and safeguarded. The plan needs to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK through sustainable farming, and therefore oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, aluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42788001	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than Snd trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staR are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by dening locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on</p> <p>Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the eRects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental eRect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!	
42788801	Question 7	Not enough information re wildlife impacts/biodiversity.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42789249	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than and trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and Hildenborough and Tonbridge Medical Practice is a good example and are constantly understated. In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by designing locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government. The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this. Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt. There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42792769	Question 7	Don't understand it!	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42793889	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large-scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the Five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		As the report sets out, the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!	
42794529	Question 7	I don't understand it	Comment noted.
42795233	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Already a dense residential development, no further development should be carried out.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42795649	Question 7	Special attention needs to be made to the Options to Prevent Merging of Settlements in the North-East of the Borough. Only options 1 and 2 should be considered to prevent Kings Hill, West Malling and East Malling from merging, otherwise this will destroy the character of East Malling and West Malling and have a detrimental effect on heritage assets as well as destroying high grade agricultural land including orchards	Comments on preventing merging of settlements noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42796225	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group is a good example and is constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in Flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood, Hildenborough and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere! Developments on the hills in hildenborough will significantly increase runoff above tonbridge without the protection of the leigh barrier</p>	
42798145	Question 7	<p>It is unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p> <p>As a Flood Warden in Hildenborough I can report that just this morning (3rd November) after a night of heavy rain there were many flashpoints for surface water flooding on the Brookmead estate. The stormwater drainage in the area is inadequate even for current levels of development and is poorly maintained.</p>	
42798817	Question 7	A key priority should be to develop and secure localised, carbon-neutral and sustainable energy sources which all households in the area can participate directly. This should include a variety of tools and sources, such as ground source heat pumps, air-based heat pumps, windmills, hydropower etc.	Comment noted.
42799617	Question 7	I think Agriculture must be included as well to ensure connecting the need to grow and produce as much food locally as possible, with the need to protect the environment, especially rivers.	Comment noted.
42799649	Question 7	I'm afraid I don't understand the question.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42800033	Question 7	<p>I can see that most of the study shows good accessibility however having good accessibility does not mean that the facilities are usable. The infrastructure for all of these areas are as previously stated over loaded. The schools at all levels are full, the doctors surgeries are full or have closed, the dentists are full no surgeries are taking NHS patients and children especially.</p> <p>The sewers and drains cannot cope with the size of the pipes now the fact that sewage discharges into the local rivers and waterways means they cannot cope now let alone with extra burden of more homes discharging into them. Health risks from disease and poisoning of the wildlife in the waterways all needs considering.</p> <p>The floodplains are still not coping in the area the flooding of areas to save the inhabited areas of the town which are still at risk, shows that this is the case.</p> <p>Transport infra structure is under threat with KCC cuts.</p>	<p>Infrastructure providers are engaged throughout the Local Plan process and a Infrastructure Deliver Plan will be prepared to reflect the needs of the development strategy.</p>
42800097	Question 7	<p>From what I have seen the policy has identified 'sites' which are publicly used green spaces and green field land, we should be protecting these areas rather than building on them!</p>	<p>Noted support for the protection of green spaces.</p>
42800897	Question 7	<p>The assessment assumes that the defined urban areas already have the services and infrastructure they need to support further expansion.</p> <p>West Malling and Kings Hill infrastructure: transport and medical facilities (for example) are unable to support the existing number of residents</p>	<p>Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42801281	Question 7	<p>Can not make head nor tail of them</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42801569	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas, it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed. Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than send trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed. In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered. It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government. The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this. Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt. There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land. There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, Tuvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence. Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre. Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected. As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere.</p>	
42801729	Question 7	The findings are not clear	Comments noted
42801793	Question 7	Agree with Option 1 only	Support for Option 1 noted.
42802081	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than Snd trained medical staR who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in Tood risk areas and</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802209	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than and trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, Tuvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42802337	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than Snd trained medical staR who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staR are in great demand and West Malling Group</p> <p>Practice is a good example and are constantly understaRed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by deSning locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the SVE Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order</p> <p>to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, TUF and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the Tash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the town's history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked</p> <p>by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42802433	Question 7	<p>Building additional housing in this area will not alleviate housing pressures as this will be outstripped from demand from outside of the area.</p> <p>Local infrastructure is already stretched for example doctors surgeries typically have long waiting lists.</p> <p>There is already significant flood risk within the local region which will be exacerbated by further building.</p> <p>Access roads are already often operating at above capacity. Accepting the additional 10% housing will cause further stress and lead to greater congestion and will have a knock on effect on air quality.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42803649	Question 7	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated, as is happening as I type this!</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42805889	Question 7	See response to Q2	Comment noted.
42806753	Question 7	<p>Option 2 will inevitably demand the use of land in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Provision of healthcare services- its easier to build practices than recruit medical staff. This is true across the whole of the NHS. More buildings does not address this.</p> <p>The Housing Market Delivery Study doesnot indicate that market demand will support the development of 10% more homes.</p> <p>Any development within Option 1 should be in keeping with existing good design in the local area/ honour the town's history/ not be higher than 5 storeys.</p> <p>We should not be building on the sites proposed in flood risk areas. Flooding is going to be increasingly frequent. We should not ignore this.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect in the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts biodiversity and the open aspect and</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Flooding will be considered and reflected within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment being prepared to support plan preparation. Regard will also be had to the AONB Management Plans where relevent.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>Development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to areas downstream.</p>	
42806945	Question 7	This answer is not a rejection of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report. I am not commenting in detail to Questions 7 and 8 as I think my answers have been covered in my earlier responses	Comment noted.
42807137	Question 7	This does not take work with the Sustainability report. Well-being is not being represented appropriately.	Comment noted.
42807937	Question 7	<p>No investigation has been included for the number of houses (to be built) to be under the 839 per annum quoted by national policy as it is considered to be unreasonable. I question who will suffer from this unreasonable consideration. Why not explore a number nearer 400 that may be more reasonably accommodated in infrastructure and environmental terms and over a longer period of time.</p> <p>Political reason alone are not enough</p>	Comment noted.
42808033	Question 7	<p>1. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of removal of land from the Green belt</p> <p>2. Healthcare facilities are already stretched in Primary and Secondary care.</p>	Comment noted.
42810913	Question 7	I broadly agree with some of the aspirations but not the pessimism. There is no plan for an aggressive shift away from private car use which could reverse many of the adverse trends identified. For example, Tonbridge and Malling could institute a heavy tax on business parking, especially for businesses outside town centres, to make such developments less attractive, and use this money to fund free or heavily subsidised bus services.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42811201	Question 7	<p>It is unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas. It will instead stimulate demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the Borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the Borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large-scale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense and would ruin the town we love. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the Borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the Council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development in the town centre, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Road, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the town's history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In South West Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in South West Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham, as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42814401	Question 7	<p>The list of sites is so fundamentally flawed it shows a lack of adequate due diligence prior to consultation. In most walks of life if something was presented with such errors it would be cast back and told to be checked and re-presented rather than continuing.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42814689	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which I believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. An ageing population will require more Care Workers living locally, this segment of the workforce require affordable homes and sustainable transport links</p> <p>Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense and will impact on air quality.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Education demand is likely to increase particularly in south Tonbridge as a result of adjoining Council housing plans and this will have a significant detrimental impact on traffic congestion, air quality so any housing within Tonbridge and Malling needs to provide suitable high quality education to the northern end of Tonbridge. In a grammar school local authority area this will mean KCC finding a way to locate a Grammar school (annexe) in North Tonbridge</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42814881	Question 7	Very superficial and not particularly helpful.	Comment noted.
42815777	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in Flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42819681	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than Snd trained medical staR who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staR are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understated.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by deSning locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on aRordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly aRordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traUc system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traUc away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the eRects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental eRect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked</p> <p>by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally aRected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of Tood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42820385	Question 7	As above, see answer to Q4	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42820609	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42822209	Question 7	I don't know where these possible future development sites came from but they clearly represent areas that should be never be considered as development locations.	Comment noted. The sites were identified through the Urban Capacity Study, the Call for Sites exercise or from unimplemented allocations in the adopted development plan.
42823713	Question 7	It is not applicable to choosing which sites are chosen do our question is not valid	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42823873	Question 7	<p>A wide selection of the sites identified are on green belt land, which should be protected for the below reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 59693 – Residential • Site 59685 – Mixed Use • Site 59721 – Residential • Site 59690 – Mixed Use • Site 59805 – Mixed Use • Site 59809 – Mixed Use <p>Protected Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West European Hedgehog (<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>) • White Admiral (<i>Limenitis Camilla</i>) • Grass Snake (<i>Natrix Helvetica</i>) • Crosswort (<i>Cruciata laevipes</i>) • Additional protected species have been identified, but due to data restriction the surveys are not able to be shared with any external party, therefore a protected species survey is necessitated <p>Pen Stream</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFD water body sensitive to sediment management • WFD water body sensitive to gravel removal • Salmonid river • Increase downstream risk of flooding from land changes of farmland to housing <p>Environmental and Country Stewardship Schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land provides winter cover crops <p>Surface Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is at risk of flooding from surface water at the 1 in 30, 1 in 100, and 1 in 1000 event • Any housing development would increase this surface flood risk to the wider area including the A26 Hadlow Road East <p>Utilities and Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil pipeline operated by GPSS (Sites 59690, 59805 59809 only) • Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane are insufficient for any potential housing development • Existing primary and secondary schools are already at capacity • Only 1 existing GP surgery, which is at capacity 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42825121	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which I believe is out of date and excessive; there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses, it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here. Option 2</p> <p>will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff to work in them. The borough is already struggling to cope with the numbers currently required.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense.</p> <p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the Five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>I have huge reservations about sites proposed in flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for the future development of Tonbridge, developments higher than 5 storeys are unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42829057	Question 7	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense.	Comment noted.
42830913	Question 7	More houses and more people are not sustainable.	Comment noted.
42833505	Question 7	It Is unreasonable to over deliver and base Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date.	Comment relating to housing figures noted.
42833985	Question 7	Green belt should be protected at all costs	Comment noted.
42834145	Question 7	It is likely that huge damage will be caused by large scale development on Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over capacity.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42834721	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than Snd trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staR are in great demand and West Malling Group Practice is a good example and are constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by deSignating locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government. The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the Save Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identiSed around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in Tood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, Tuvial and surface water Tooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there. Modelling demonstrates that the Tash Tooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars</p>	<p>Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood and around Trench Wood and on Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traUc system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traUc away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the eRects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental eRect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally aRected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on eRect in terms of Tood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p>	
42835073	Question 7	<p>As above - question 6.</p> <p>In addition to the need to consider the existing population transfer in Hildenborough for example from London there also needs to be consideration of the fact that as a highly sort after location due to its position, village status and open green spaces, an increase in the number of buildings will not necessarily meet the housing needs of the borough but will in fact just draw more people to relocate here from London boroughs which in turn will increase house prices, not lower them to make them more affordable.</p>	Comment noted.
42835105	Question 7	<p>It unreasonable to over-deliver and base the Local Plan on meeting the assessed housing needs target which we already believe is out of date and excessive. Also, there is no logic to suggest that building more housing to meet supposed demand will lower the price of houses in either of the Housing Market Areas it will simply stimulate more demand and more people will relocate here rather than meeting demand from within the borough. Option 2 will inevitably increase the likelihood of land being removed from the Green Belt for development which is opposed.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that it is easier to build the physical medical centres than find trained medical staff who would work in them. The evidence that we have seen in the borough already is that we struggle to cope with the numbers currently required, let alone 10% more. Trained medical staff are in great demand and West Malling Group is a</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>good example and is constantly understaffed.</p> <p>In terms of land where there are mineral deposits, where these are scarce, they should be worked before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is likely that huge damage will be caused by largescale development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge. Arterial roads and many junctions are already operating over-capacity, so the idea that we would increase this additional burden by voluntarily accepting 10% more housing makes no sense. The evidence highlights the fact that we have 7 Air Quality Management Areas which are likely to be negatively impacted even further by defining locations for a further 10% beyond the target set for the borough by the Government.</p>	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. Site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The proposal that building 10% more homes will have a favourable impact on affordability for those looking to buy property is rejected. The Housing Market Delivery Study does not indicate that market demand will support Option 2. We need to focus on providing accommodation for those living locally and that can be achieved by building truly affordable rented homes and we know that social housing is the way to deliver this.</p> <p>Regarding the five Spatial Strategy Options, although Option One is chosen the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that the council's previous policies have seen substantial development in the town centre. Although a relatively dense residential development, the area identified around the Angel Centre and the commercial centre of Tonbridge will reduce the need to build elsewhere at a higher environmental cost and impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is insufficient importance placed on retaining agricultural land in order to encourage and facilitate food security for the UK in this report, so oppose development on Grade 1, 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There are huge reservations about sites proposed in Flood risk areas and although there are mitigating architectural solutions to the potential resilience of some town centre sites using SUDS, fluvial and surface water flooding will have ever-worsening impact on communities who will be living there.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates that the flash flooding due to intense summer rain will be an increasingly frequent occurrence.</p> <p>Although Option 1 is selected out of the two options given for The future development of Tonbridge, development higher than 5 storeys is unacceptable and the architecture of any new development should be sympathetic to nearby buildings and in harmony with existing examples of good design such as those on Medway Wharf Rd, the gabled building in the High Street and Whitefriars Wharf which acknowledge the towns history. It is better to have development in the town centre where car use will be reduced because of services being close to hand and the accessibility of rail services than to develop on Green Belt land. In SW Tonbridge, Higham Wood, Hildenborough and around Trench Wood and on</p> <p>Tonbridge Farm, where there are few alternatives to using cars to access services, we have a massively congested traffic system with an Air Quality Management Area at its heart. A one-way system to divert 50% of traffic away from Tonbridge High Street may mitigate the effects of more development in the town centre.</p> <p>Development in SW Tonbridge will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as the area is overlooked by it and of course negatively impacts respect biodiversity and the open aspect and character of the landscape would be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>As the report sets out the impact of development on the Green Belt around Tonbridge will have a knock-on effect in terms of flood risk to communities downstream such as East Peckham as it will increase the number of impermeable surfaces, because the water has to go somewhere!</p> <p>Developments on the hills in hildenborough will significantly increase runoff above tonbridge without the protection of the leigh barrier.</p>	
42180641	Question 8	Not qualified to disagree	Comment Noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42213665	Question 8	In general, I agree with the findings but would like to emphasise my opinions according to the following principles: Small "infill" developments on sites with good existing infrastructure should be encouraged. The development of large "greenfield" sites for example: site numbers 59594,59740,59631,59749 should be opposed to preserve agricultural land. The development of large areas of open space for example: site numbers 59861,5619-21,59636,59698,59715 should be opposed to prevent urban sprawl and the merging of different locales into continuous urbanisation. There should be no northward extension of Kings Hill for example: site numbers 59643,59655,59807,59814. For the same reasons. There should be no southward extension to Kings Hill for example: site numbers 59752,59759,59761,59797. For the same reasons.	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42438369	Question 8	Yes. I understand that the majority of development has been in the built up areas of Tonbridge and that there is consequently far less potential there now. It seems clear therefore that development must go into less developed areas starting with those that have the best existing infrastructure.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.
42438785	Question 8	Proximity to essential services using cycle ways and footpaths are essential. Lots of rural areas have no footpaths or dedicated cycle ways.	Comment noted.
42439169	Question 8	The reports on the studies of the various areas appear to be very comprehensive.	Comment noted.
42440961	Question 8	Largely, but these macro assessments and principles must be tempered with actual local specific consideration.	Comment noted.
42441185	Question 8	As Q7 it's clear that TM Borough Northeast region offers more readily available "areas of interest" for meeting development requirements, due to former industrial use of land. Using TMBC 2040 vision to meet NPPF requirements.	Comment noted.
42107937	Question 8	No further comment.	Comment noted.
42519201	Question 8	Yes in principal, but I do not believe the Borough Green and Long Mill area has sufficient infrastructure to support major development	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42587393	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities. etc.</p>	<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.</p>
42646849	Question 8	Generally Although the maps did not zoom in so I can't be sure about my specific area.	Comment noted
39049377	Question 8	The report has fine words.	Comment noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42585729	Question 8	<p>I agreed with most of the findings of the following 14 sites in Watlingtonbury:</p> <p>59700 59845 59624 59723 59799 59797 59664 59728 59729 59654 59803 59800 59802 59722</p> <p>However, please note my comments in section 4.3 of this consultation as I have expressed my thoughts and concerns regarding these particular sites.</p>	Comment noted
42721633	Question 8	See 1367 in questions	Comment noted.
42438273	Question 8	<p>As a principle most sites appear to have very little positives and a number of negatives.</p> <p>These represent destruction of greenbelt/rural landscape, increased pressure on already challenged infrastructure and adverse environmental impact.</p>	Comment noted.
42772033	Question 8	<p>I agree with most of the findings of the following 14 sites in Watlingtonbury: 59700 59845 59624 59723 59799 59797 59664 59728 59729 59654 59803 59800 59802 59722. However, please note my comments in section 4.3 of this consultation as I have expressed my thoughts and concerns regarding these particular sites.</p>	Comment noted.
42792577	Question 8	<p>The assessments seem reasonable. In particular being in an area in Brookmead with a significant risk from flash-flooding (varying levels of water in my bungalow 4 times since 2019) I would emphasize the comments on Sites 59615, 59653, 59656, 59669, 59692 and 59679 about flood risk which would not only affect properties on these sites but increase the risk for existing properties in Stocks Green Road, Leigh Road and the Brookmead estate.</p>	Comment noted. All forms of flood risk will be considered within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42821729	Question 8	<p>What is not clear (to me) is are these all options are might they go all ahead</p> <p>Site 59881 - agree. There are some key negative points that have been identified - SA Objectives 5,6 & 7 Site 59707 - as above Site 59611 - as above Site 59720 - as above Site 59877 - fair assessment Site 59748 this depends on what happens with 59877. Together these developments will overload the area</p>	Comment noted.
38377665	Question 8	Only looked at the sites in Aylesford, 59464, 59469, 59472 and 59781. I have no argument with any of these 4	Comment noted.
42544513	Question 8	I am totally not in favour of the majority of sites nominated in Call for Sites. Why do all these sites have to be on green belt land? The Golf Course!!!???	Comment noted.
42798817	Question 8	In general I agree with the findings, however the devil is in the detail and so it is difficult to respond to this without having seen the detailed plans that comprised decision-making and related inputs which informed the summary presented within Annex 1.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42521025	Question 8	<p>59806; 59811</p> <p>Given the site assessment findings I do not understand why these sites are being considered for development.</p> <p>59795</p> <p>This site seems to comprise both green belt and brownfield site. It is situated within green belt land and a development here would be completely out of context, as well as being removed from key infrastructure.</p>	Comment noted.
38372161	Question 8	<p>I am not in favour of the vast majority of sites nominated in the call for sites. Again, are there any brown field locations that can be used?</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42713185	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p>	
42716897	Question 8	My answer is limited to sites in Hildenborough and is qualified by my specific observations in my separate response to these sites.	Comment noted.
42793089	Question 8	My answer is limited to sites in Hildenborough and is qualified by my specific observations in my separate response to these sites.	Comment noted.
42816257	Question 8	We act on behalf of a key landowner of Site Reference 59796. We broadly agree with the findings of the site assessment for this site. We note the potential yield is identified as “TBC”. Our own Call for Sites submission identified the capacity as 120 units which we consider to be an appropriate potential yield based on the range of development options on this site. We recommend this potential yield is included in an allocation policy for the site. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the content of such a policy in advance of the next Regulation 19 stage consultation.	Comment noted.
42668097	Question 8	<p>Site 59615 - i agree with the negative assessments for this site, in particular relating to flood risk, loss of green and open spaces.</p> <p>Site 59656 - i agree with the negative assessments for this site, in particular relating to flood risk, loss of green and open spaces.</p> <p>Site 59692 - i agree with the negative assessments for this site, in particular relating to flood risk, loss of green and open spaces.</p>	Comment noted.
42080705	Question 8	This document is a nightmare to navigate with no clear organisation or grouping of sites by location or address, sifting through 5000+ submission in a single sheet with no point of reference is very difficult. It is impossible to verify the robustness of the findings as a result and this must be set out much more clearly in future rounds of consultation.	Comment noted.
42197121	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, Yes No 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42202625	Question 8	There is too much emphasis on the potential to mitigate loss of habitat/biodiversity etc through development. You cannot develop a children's play area or large green open space and not have a loss of amenity space/habitat and biodiversity. There is an absolute disregard for homeowner's in the vicinity of these proposed sites and the impact it will have on their lives and wellbeing.	comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42260449	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42078145	Question 8	There are no plans for infrastructure for any of the sites. Schools, medical centres etc are not detailed and therefore it is impossible to reach an opinion.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
38756449	Question 8	Any site in the Green Belt should not be developed, and in particular rural settlements should not be extended. New settlements should if needed should be close to existing motorways, hospitals etc	Comment noted.
42437217	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. Yes No 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42438113	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42439137	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *59685 *59690 *59693 *59721 *59805 *59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural low-density character of North Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42438529	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441665	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441697	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441825	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441857	Question 8	<p>I object to any development on the following sites in the SAR: 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809</p> <p>I object to development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441985	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42444353	Question 8	<p>Further development of site will increase traffic even more and there are no incentives to use public transport. Rural villages are not served by mainland stations so even more congestion will occur from commuters reaching train stations. Traffic along the A26 hadlow > tonbridge is incredibly busy at peak times and this will get worse. The development will also lead to a loss of biodiversity and remove the semi rural nature of the local area. There is no easy access to shops, schools, medical facilities from these new developments.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42448545	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>Mammals seen on Grange Farm land include:</p> <p>Badgers, hedgehogs, foxes, roe deer, field and door mice, voles and shrews, slow worms, toads, bats, dragonflies, various moths and butterflies, various fungi, wildflowers.</p> <p>Nesting Birds: Woodpecker - green and lesser spotted, bluetit families, heron, buzzards, long-tailed tits, nuthatch, starlings, robins, collared doves, wood pigeons, sparrows, pheasants, swallows, seagulls, owls, magpies, crows and wrens.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42453697	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the metropolitan green belt fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2. They consist of productive best most valuable agricultural land (Grades I, 2 and 3a) The importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification. 3. They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4. Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells BC Local plan This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elms Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5. Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6. Development will irrevocably alter the open semi rural low density character of North Tonbridge. 7. Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8. There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9. These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42459937	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange farm and Greentrees:</p> <p>.59685 .59690 .59693 .59721 .59805 .59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites due to the following;</p> <p>(1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>(2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable Agricultural Land (Grades 1.2 ,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, The MAFF survey report of April 1991,carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>(3) they are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land is saturated.</p> <p>(4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic especially on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge well BC local plan. roads significantly affected include; A26/Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham lane.</p> <p>(5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>(6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi rural , low density character of North Tonbridge.</p> <p>(7) development will add even more stress on to already overstretched local health and education services.</p> <p>(8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>(9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities; ie: shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42460449	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42462145	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of ~Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the Metropolitan green belt fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF This was the principal reason why we were not included in the previous development plan. 2. They consist of productive best most valuable agricultural land (Grades I, 2 and 3a) The importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification.# 3. They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4. Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into ~Tonbridge and other local roads. <p>The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in ~Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells BC local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6. Development will irrevocably alter the open semi rural low density character of North Tonbridge 7. Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8. There will be significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9. These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities ie shops schools medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42457057	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>In respect to site 59657: this has already had a planning application refused and all the reasons still apply especially flooding and dangerous egress.</p> <p>In respect to site 59834: Ludicrous! The objections are too numerous to list. Access, pollution to river, totally car reliant, access to utilities, flooding etc. etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42470273	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42472993	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42325153	Question 8	<p>I have not studied each and everyone of the 290 sites identified in the call for sites. However the criteria for assessment appear to be sensible and reasonable.</p> <p>Supported by necessary improvements in infrastructure, new waste water treatment, new potable water supply, additional electricity generation and distribution, additional communications and telecom networks, improved gas supplies, as well as local highway improvements, and restructured bus services to provide communication and connectivity between villages and towns.</p>	comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42470753	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42487233	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>In respect to site 59657: this has already had a planning application refused and all the reasons still apply especially flooding and dangerous access and egress.</p> <p>In respect to site 59834: Ludicrous! The objections are too numerous to list. Access, pollution to river, totally car reliant, access to utilities, flooding, inaccessibility etc. etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42439617	Question 8	<p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites because they form a vital part of the metropolitan green belt fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF</p> <p>they consist of the Best Most Valuable agricultural land. the war in Ukraine has highlighted the importance of this . The MAFF survey of April 1991 confirms this classification</p> <p>They are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain springs which bubble when the land is saturated.</p> <p>Existing peak traffic congestion will be worsened</p> <p>A significant loss of biodiversity</p> <p>The open semi rural character of north Tonbridge would be no more</p> <p>Even more stress on education and local health services</p> <p>A negative impact on the centre of town due to the expansion of the boundaries</p> <p>These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42495617	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42499233	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42436385	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42517665	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	
42519233	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42520609	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42520737	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42496161	Question 8	<p>The comments refer to the following sites</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to these sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form part of the Metropolitan Green Belt 2. After the war in Ukraine I thought the need for better self efficiency in agriculture would be obvious. These sites consist of Grade 1,2 and 3A agricultural land 3. They are prone to flooding in wet weather 4. The local drainage system cannot even support the existing housing. Twice our house has almost flooded when the main drains have become overwhelmed 5. Development on these sites will exacerbate the existing peak time problems on the A26 getting into Tonbridge 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42532353	Question 8	<p>Site 59688- land subject to flooding. Currently used as a leisure (golf) facility.</p> <p>59669- land had previous withdrawn planning application- land subject to flooding, 59679- land subject to flooding, will cause additional risk to flooding in village and further into Stocks Green, Brookmead, Leigh Road and connecting roads. 59615- cause additional flooding to that already experienced by residents of Stocks Green. 59692- cause additional flooding to Stocks Green, Brookmead and surrounding areas. 59656- cause additional flooding to Stocks Green, and village. 59653- cause additional flooding as above. ALL sites are unsuitable in addition to potential flooding as there is insufficient infrastructure to support the existing population in terms of schools, transport (very heavy traffic), educational and medical support. HMG cannot support the existing community and schools are over subscribed. An additional 1500+ homes is unsustainable.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42479393	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42540865	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42273793	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42555937	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42543553	Question 8	<p>Green trees & Grange Farm 59685</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42584193	Question 8	<p>The report does not address the impact of the proposed development on existing property i.e. the increase of surface water runoff from the new development will have a detrimental effect to adjacent areas that are already prone to flooding from surface water runoff.</p> <p>Sites:- 59615, 59653, 59656, 59669, 59679, 59688, 59692, 59704, if developed would increase the risk of flooding to existing houses in Stocks Green Road, Leigh Road and the Brookmead estate as the existing infrastructure is not capable of dealing with the surface water at extreme times furthermore it would bring added pressure on the road network that is already extremely busy especially around peak times and school drop off and collection times.</p> <p>Sites:- 59625, 59823, 59745, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59823, 59835, if developed would become an urban sprawl that would connect Tonbridge to Hildenborough thereby losing the gap between the two separate entities.</p> <p>The main road through Hildenborough to Tonbridge is already extremely busy and could not support the additional traffic.</p> <p>The local schools are already at capacity as is the doctor's surgery.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42584033	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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.</p>
42584705	Question 8	<p>Site 59552, 59550, 59571 and 59572 have been identified through the Urban capacity study. They would have minimal impact on the housing needs of the borough but with significant negative impact on all existing residents of the area - removing well used green spaces and Brindles Field playground which is the only playground in this area of the town. They would have negative environmental impact, removing space that could be used as meadowland as currently in some cases.</p> <p>Development on those sites, plus sites 59765, 59641, 59767, 59695 and 59869 would also increase road traffic on the Brook Street/Quarry hill roundabout which is already significantly above capacity at peak times, further impacting on health/wellbeing (in proximity to several schools and a nursery) through idling cars and congestion. It would significantly negatively impact accessibility to services due to increased traffic and current poor provision through buses (for those who cant cycle). Sussex road school already does not serve the needs of the existing housing stock with many residents of the area having to travel elsewhere.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42584737	Question 8	<p>The report does not address the impact of the proposed development on existing property i.e. the increase of surface water runoff from the new development will have a detrimental effect to adjacent areas that are already prone to flooding from surface water runoff.</p> <p>Sites:- 59615, 59653, 59656, 59669, 59679, 59688, 59692, 59704, if developed would increase the risk of flooding to existing houses in Stocks Green Road, Leigh Road and the Brookmead estate as the existing infrastructure is not capable of dealing with the surface water at extreme times furthermore it would bring added pressure on the road network that is already extremely busy especially around peak times and school drop off and collection times.</p> <p>Sites:- 59625, 59823, 59745, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59823, 59835, if developed would become an urban sprawl that would connect Tonbridge to Hildenborough thereby losing the gap between the two separate entities.</p> <p>The main road through Hildenborough to Tonbridge is already extremely busy and could not support the additional traffic.</p> <p>The local schools are already at capacity as is the doctor's surgery.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42586177	Question 8	<p>2.1) General Objections applying to all sites around Watlington</p> <p>(i) Traffic. Watlington suffers significant traffic problems at various times of the day sitting on the A26 to Maidstone. In the village the A26 is narrow by modern standards & restricted by residents parked traffic. Pedestrian pavements are narrow and potentially dangerous. Any additional developments will increase traffic flows having environmental and safety impacts. I understand the area around the Watlington crossroads is already the most polluted part of the Borough.</p> <p>(ii) Shops and Services. Watlington does not have an infrastructure of shops and services to support the community, no significant leisure facilities, secondary schools, veterinary services, and very limited health care support. This infrastructure is unable to support further housing growth in the area.</p> <p>(iii) Water. During 2022 there were occasions in the village, when South-East Water was unable to provide a fresh water supply. TMBC will need to be satisfied that, with climate change, the village is properly supported with adequate fresh water supplies and infrastructure to meet its existing needs, let alone the demands of new housing in the future.</p> <p>(iv) Environment. The proposals in this area will adversely impact the area's CO2 levels from both the new build on greenfield sites and increased traffic flows.</p> <p>(v) Health and Well-Being. In all the site cases set out below, we would suggest TMBC's approach to assessing Health and Well-Being has too narrow a focus</p> <p>A number of sites (59654, 59664, 59700, 59728, 59803, 59845 and 59729) reference proximity to existing health care facilities. Personal experience, however demonstrates that these facilities are already inadequate for the existing local population.</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42517025	Question 8	<p>Our interest (by residence and desire to protect our local environ, while wishing to support the optimal development of Tonbridge and the wider borough) is particularly in the following sites, which are situated to the north-east of Tonbridge (Higham) toward Hadlow, on land we know as Greentrees and Grange Farm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59693) • 59685) together the 3 represent Greentrees • 59721) <p>and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 which also encompasses: • 59809 together the 2 represent Grange Farm <p>and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59805 which combines all the above 5 individual sites. <p>We agree with the negative findings for these collective sites with regard to loss of green belt / designated open space, capacity of services, building on Flood Zone 3. We object to any proposed development on these collective and individual sites, for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Designated Green Belt (we understand the precise reason why the sites have been precluded for previous plans) 2) Destruction of Grade 1-3 , essential agricultural land 3) The area is prone to flooding - something we have witnessed twice on the past few years. We also understand the land contains hidden springs which spill over when the land becomes drenched from very heavy rainfall. 4) There would be significant additional strain on the single main A26 road, which already suffers daily peak period traffic congestion, particularly toward Tonbridge (and we have mentioned already the threat from the Capel & Tudeley development). 5) We already suffer regular additional 'cut through' traffic, with excessive speeds and risks to residents, despite the 20mph restrictions, via Three Elm Lane, Cranford Road, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 6) Finally, the loss of green belt land would of course result in significant loss of biodiversity and geodiversity, and further change, irrevocably, the open, semi-rural, low-density character of this area of the borough. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42587297	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. <p>They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way, Orchard Drive and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity in planned and surrounding areas. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 These fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt. These Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>2) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic Flood risk assessment.</p> <p>3) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>4) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>6) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>7) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>8) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>9) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>10) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42587713	Question 8	<p>Sites 59800 and 59802; although there are bus stops on the A26, the service along the A26 is infrequent. There are bus stops on Kings Hill, but the busses see little use. These two sites will inevitably result in significantly increased traffic down Canon Lane (a quiet lane, only single track with a dangerous junction onto the A26) and have a negative impact on the Air Quality at Watringbury Crossroads.</p> <p>Sites 59624, 59797 and 59799: see comments for 59802; in addition this is Grade 1 Agricultural land.</p> <p>Any increase in traffic through Watringbury will exacerbate the situation at the Crossroad, which already breaches the UK limit on NO2 levels. The three monitoring sites in Watringbury have consistently been the worst three in the Borough over the last 5 years.</p> <p>Site 59729 is Grade 1 Agricultural land and will increase traffic down Red Hill, which is the least bad NO2 site in Watringbury but still exceeds the UK limit.</p> <p>Site 59803 is Grade 1 Agricultural land.</p> <p>For all of these, the Report makes mention of green space available nearby. Development on these sites will remove that green space.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42588609	Question 8	<p>Sites 59800 and 59802; there are bus stops on the A26 but the service is unreliable. There are bus stops on Kings Hill, but the busses see little use. These two sites will inevitably result in significantly increased traffic down Canon Lane (a quiet lane, only single track with a dangerous junction onto the A26) and have a negative impact on the Air Quality at Watringbury Crossroads.</p> <p>Sites 59624, 59797 and 59799: see comments for 59802; in addition this is Grade 1 Agricultural land.</p> <p>Any increase in traffic through Watringbury will exacerbate the situation at the Crossroad, which already breaches the UK limit on NO2 levels. The three monitoring sites in Watringbury have consistently been the worst three in the Borough over the last 5 years. Air pollution has been recognised as a cause of a person's death in Southwark: we do not wish for the same action to be needed here.</p> <p>Site 59729 is Grade 1 Agricultural land and will increase traffic down Red Hill, which is the least bad NO2 site in Watringbury but still exceeds the UK limit.</p> <p>Site 59803 is Grade 1 Agricultural land.</p> <p>For all of these, the Report makes mention of green space available nearby. Development on these sites will remove that green space.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42589121	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42590049	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42519585	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42590945	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42594593	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42604961	Question 8	<p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to development on these sites for these reasons:</p> <p>a) They are part of the essential Green Belt. They have not been included in any previous development plan. b) The areas are productive and most valuable agricultural land. The classification was assessed in previous surveys. c) The areas are very prone to flooding and the land becomes easily saturated. d) Development of these areas would increase traffic and create greater strain on the feeder roads to Hadlow Road and Shipbourne Road. These are Barchester Way and Higham Lane. e) Development would lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. f) The character of North Tonbridge is that of being open, semi-rural and low density. g) Development would create more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. h) Development would have a negative impact on the functioning of the Town Centre due to expansion of the town boundaries and the resultant population increase. i) The areas are not easily accessible to the local facilities such as shops.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42609057	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42199073	Question 8	reference nos 59707 and 59731. This is grade 1 and 2 agricultural use located actually in the green belt and AONB	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42616161	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 4) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 5) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 6) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 7) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 8) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 9) Lastly, these sites are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs. which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42617921	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42626305	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42627009	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38330593	Question 8	<p>59784/59832 - Bell Lane - This is extending a current planning application (TM22/01767) which removes the recreation ground from 59819. (Section 5 Community facilities & Section 1 Climate Change)</p> <p>59819 Agree with</p> <p>59818 - Disagree. Historically used for waste disposal. Site contaminated. With the spoils deposited over many, many years from the old Reed International Works, also fringes on nature reserve. Great crested newt habitat.</p> <p>59820 - Disagree - Planning application Southern Extension (TM/21/01939), observations already submitted.</p> <p>59787 - Disagree - Should retain the Allotment area and community facilities, and landscape impact would be great</p>	comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42638305	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42640865	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42641121	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42641665	Question 8	<p>I refer to the following sites on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees. -59685 -59690 -59693 -59721 -59805 -59809</p> <p>I object to the development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principle reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing traffic congestion on the A26 and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads including Hadlow Rd, Crawford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low density character of North Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to expansion of town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42593313	Question 8	<p>North Tonbridge sites: Greentrees and Grange Farm 59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>These are part of the Metropolitan Green Belt and for that reason were not included in the previous development plan. They are productive Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A). They are prone to flooding in wet weather with hidden springs bubbling when land is saturated. To develop these sites will increase peak traffic congestion on A26 into Tonbridge and surrounding roads. There would be a loss of biodiversity and the open, semi-rural, low density character of Tonbridge would be altered. Additional stress on already overstretched local educational and healthcare services. The expansion of the town boundaries and increased population will have a negative impact on the functioning of the town. These sites not easily accessible to local facilities. Also there are no pavements of street lights or access to main drainage</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42617505	Question 8	<p>Site 59740 Broadwater Farm.</p> <p>A. This site does not seem suitable for inclusion in the Local Plan going forward given the relatively poor rating against TMBC's Sustainability Assessment criteria.</p> <p>B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of high grade farm land • Harm to many heritage assets including listed buildings, Conservation Area and landscape features • Coalescence of East Malling, West Malling, Kings Hill and nearby hamlets • Harm to the aquifer and lack of consideration of hydrogeology issues • Harm to Quiet Lanes and rural road network • Critical stress on existing road, medical & other infrastructure • The existing consultation for this site elicited over 1,500 objection responses from official consultees, 	<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.</p>
42647393	Question 8	<p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809 These sites are part of land known as Grange Farm and Green Trees</p> <p>1. They form a vital part of the MGB fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why there were not included in the previous development plan</p> <p>2. They consist of productive, best most valuable agricultural land (grades1,2,3a), the importance of which have been highlighted by the recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine and Brexit. The MAFF survey report (April 1991) carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3. They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4 Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading in and out of Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will become further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the TWBC local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane, Hunt Road and Whistler Road.</p> <p>5. Deveopment will lead to a significant loss in biodiversity</p> <p>6. Deveopment will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural low-density character of north Tonbridge</p> <p>7. It will put even more stress on the already stretched local doctors, vets, dentists and education services (schools, special schools, nurseries, social support)</p> <p>8. There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase, including parking, railway parking.</p> <p>9. These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities such as medical facilities</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42648417	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>Question 9 Do you agree with this set of strategi</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42388225	Question 8	<p>I think the document is ambiguous. It includes enormous sites such as the one at Borough Green which should be a totally seperate issue.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42445025	Question 8	<p>The sites in North Tonbridge are concentrated in one area (Greentrees & Grange Farm) and the comments apply to all of them: 59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>1) They are all designated as Green Belt and have previously not been included as development sites. 2) They consist of most valuable agricultural land (grades 1,2 and 3A). In view of recent world events we should not be squandering this type of land. 3) They tend to become flooded during spells of heavy rain. 4) If these developments go ahead it could mean the A26 would become even more jammed and would lead to increased traffic on the surrounding urban areas e.g. Higham Lane, where the new developments are proposed. 5) Loss of biodiversity 6) Existing schools and medical services are barely coping now and any additional developments would put excessive strain on them.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42671521	Question 8	<p>Leybourne has very limited green space to enjoy and use for relaxation.</p> <p>With the already approved sites at Broadwater and others we are already losing our green space.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42456385	Question 8	<p>My comments refer to the following sites situated to the north of Tonbridge on land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42616225	Question 8	<p>My comments are for the land on Grange Farm and Green Trees.</p> <p>I object to any Development on these sites for these reasons</p> <p>1-They consist of productive agricultural land,grade 1,2,3a.</p> <p>2-They are a important part of Green Belt.</p> <p>3-They are prone to flooding .</p> <p>4-This development will put pressure on health and education services.</p> <p>4-Development will lead to loss of biodiversity.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42659905	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42703521	Question 8	<p>Ref: 59758, North of Beech Road is described as being in a flood zone. It is at the top of a hill.</p> <p>Ref: 59758, 59750, 59597, 59816, 59598, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59754, 59757 are accessed by roads that are already used beyond safe capacity.</p>	comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42702945	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42709409	Question 8	<p>59597 - within flood risk area.</p> <p>59598 - this is heavily forested and important to biodiversity.</p> <p>59599 - missing from Annex 1</p> <p>59750 - heavily flood prone.</p> <p>59752 - heavily flood prone.</p> <p>59754 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape</p> <p>59755 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape</p> <p>59757 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape</p> <p>59758 - heavily flood prone.</p> <p>59759 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape</p> <p>59760 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape.</p> <p>59816 - missing from Annex 1</p>	comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42711009	Question 8	<p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42711937	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42711105	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42711041	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 59685 * 59690 * 59693 * 59721 * 59805 * 59809 <p>I object to any development of these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principle reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A) the importance of which has ben highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge wells Borough plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity .6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi rural, low-density character of Tonbridge of North Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of Town Centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42712801	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, lowdensity character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42470209	Question 8	<p>Site 59597 only very small part of this is brownfield majority greenfield grazing and arable. additional housing except on restricted exclusive basis would not have access to schooling facilities. access to main village would cause major and unacceptable traffic flows leading to gridlock. major effect on wildlife and countryside pursuits, road infrastructure would need to be implemented and improved; change of building style used bt developers would impact on heritage and history of area</p>	comments noted.
42707297	Question 8	<p>59657 - i agree broadly with ratings, however would just encourage that this area must be packed with bio-diversity such is the growth of green material within this area. I would also recommend it be noted that the entry and exit junction proposed is opposite Higham Lane onto an already very busy Hadlow Road/ Cornwallis Avenue. This will only contribute to congestion.</p> <p>59834 - agree broadly with ratings but would like it noted that entry and exit is onto a very busy Hadlow road, the size of the development proposed would exacerbate this. It's placed directly on a flood plain, with potential to cause not only issues for itself but further down stream. It should also be noted that this area is naturally very stunning and many people enjoy it's beauty every day, both on the river and land. Altering it's appearance and use through development on the proposed scale will change everything about it and Tonbridge forever.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42714369	Question 8	<p>The comments refer to the following sites</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to these sites for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form part of the Metropolitan Green Belt 2. It is clear that the status quo in terms of food production no longer exists due to the war in Ukraine. These sites consist of Grade 1,2 and 3A agricultural land 3. They are prone to flooding in wet weather 4. The local drainage systems cannot cope with existing demand 5. Development on these sites will cause further demand at peaks times on the A26 into Tonbridge town centre which struggles to cope as it is. 	Comments noted.The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42715457	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42651777	Question 8	<p>59637 Any development on the site would have a significant negative effect for existing users of the footpath and for visitors to the Cemetery on their enjoyment of the countryside and views of the Grade II listed Hadlow Tower. The site is also prone to regular flooding and run-off from any development could affect the health of the nearby pond. There is no infrastructure to allow safe cycling around Hadlow and between the village and Tonbridge. Access would involve significant developmet of other green belt land.</p> <p>59638 The junction of the access road with the A26 is dangerous due to visibility and the speed of traffic using the A26. The location of the site next to the pond would impact the quality of the water in the pond and the wildlife that use it. The site is Green Belt and agricultural land (regularly used for grazing sheep). Any development would adversely impact the rural setting of the pond, currently with trees and field behind it. There is no infrastructure to allow safe cycling around Hadlow and between the village and Tonbridge.</p> <p>59686 The Hadlow medical centre is over-subscribed with no room for expansion. The junction of the proposed access road with the A26 is dangerous. The site is Green Belt and agricultural land (regularly used for grazing sheep). There is no infrastructure to allow safe cycling around Hadlow and between the village and Tonbridge.</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.
42716065	Question 8	<p>Ref no59759/59760/ 59755/59758</p> <p>These areas have insufficient access,pretty single tract roads that if made larger would ruin the whole village outlook. Where would the hedgerow wildlife go to. No infrastructure</p> <p>Ref no 59816 along the street in mereworth. This road is blocked especially at school times frequently with traffic having difficulty passing through</p>	Comment noted.
42716353	Question 8	I have no idea what this question means	comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42192289	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42716545	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 5980559809</p> <p>I object to any development of these sites because</p> <p>1 they form a vital part of the Metropolitan green belt 2 they consist of productive agricultural land more important to preserve now than ever before 3 they are prone to flooding and contain hidden springs 4 development of these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion all around the local area 5 development will lead to significant loss of biodiversity 6 development will alter the open semi-rural low density character of north Tonbridge 7 the local health and education services are already stretched, further development will cause even more stress on these areas 8 negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to expansion of town boundaries and population increase 9 these sites are not easily accessible to local facilities and amenities</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42589057	Question 8	<p>59601 greenbelt land, prone to flooding. 59637 greenbelt land, prone to flooding, and site is on a narrow lane. 59638 greenbelt land, prone to flooding, and detrimental to wildlife, as immediately behind a pond. 59647 and 59853 Court lane is a narrow, busy lane, prone to flooding. 59776 Carpenters lane already has too much traffic to handle any more. 59811 greenbelt land. beautiful land belonging to Historic Oxenhoath estate, again, surrounded by narrow lanes, Carpenters Lane would again be impacted. All other sites in Hadlow are prone to flooding, and would impact on local roads and amenities. Hadlow Medical Centre is full.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42717505	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42378241	Question 8	<p>I do not agree with the methodology used by this study. For example the Borough Green Gardens site is treated as a single unit spatially. In reality it is 5 different quarries all at different stages of quarrying. There is no point in ticking a box twice because part of the site is close to a station if the other end of the site is miles away. There is no point on ticking a box because there is a local school when it is obvious that an extra 3,000 families will need multiple new school forms and huge infrastructure that's currently not present.</p> <p>It would be far better to make a serious attempt to quantify the infrastructure required, including an end to end 'Relief Road', and estimating costs it in order to determine if the proposal is even viable.</p> <p>Can a road be built in time given that the quarries keep extending their time horizon to complete quarrying</p>	Comment noted.
42718689	Question 8	<p>Sites 59720, 59608, 59871,59793,59709,59872,59770,59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbeltAONB</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42718433	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42718753	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already overstretched local health and education services and will require a large financial in the infrastructure.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42719105	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees.</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development of these sites for the following reasons</p> <p>1 They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous plan.</p> <p>2 They consist of productive agricultural land the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine.</p> <p>3 They are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4 Development on these sites will exacerbate peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads.</p> <p>5 Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6 Development will irrevocably alter the open semi-rural low density character of north Tonbridge</p> <p>7 Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8 There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9 These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42719809	Question 8	<p>Borough Green Garden City is wrongly described as a single site, when in reality it covers multiple sites, each of which has different access to infrastructure.</p> <p>However, the principle of using the brown-field quarries is sensible if the required transport and other infrastructure is built first.</p> <p>The individual sites around Wrotham do not make sense, as there is only basic road infrastructure within Wrotham, in particular the sites on the other side of the village from the M2/M20 link. Additionally, there is only limited community infrastructure within Wrotham, so any new housing is likely to put pressure on transport infrastructure as people need to access schools/shops etc in other villages such as Borough Green.</p>	<p>Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42605921	Question 8	<p>Site 59406 – Barfield Farm – 20 houses This piece of land sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham Village Together with Site 59596, this would be the equivalent of building another Pepingstraw Close on the edge of the Village. Such a development is not sustainable in a small village.</p> <p>There is one pub, one church, a single form entry primary school and a Farm Shop - part of the Spadework Charity at the opposite end of the Village to this site. Currently a bus service operates infrequently and after KCC will cease. Most residents are dependent on private transport.</p> <p>Traffic generation to and from the site will be of significance to the village. Offham village is a rat run for Kings Hill and other areas travelling to and from the A20/M26/20 intersections. At both morning/evening peak times there is a constant stream of traffic along Teston Road and the proposed site entrance is at a particularly point in the road where traffic speeds up leaving the Village and tends to speed into the Village before breaking heavily before the bend just past the proposed entrance. Vehicle movements from 20/43 more houses entering/exiting Teston Road would have a detrimental impact on traffic movements through the Village in addition to the added dangers of the location of access at this site.</p> <p>Site 59596 – field North of site 59406 – 23 houses This piece of land sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham Village and is in zoned Metropolitan Green Belt. Offham Parish Council is utterly opposed to any building on the Green Belt especially adjacent to semi natural, ancient woodland. Together with Site 59406, this would be the equivalent of building another Pepingstraw Close on the edge of the Village.</p> <p>There is one pub, one church, a single form entry primary school and a Farm Shop - part of the Spadework Charity at the opposite end of the Village to this site. Currently a bus service operates infrequently and after KCC will cease. Most residents are dependent on private transport. Such a development is not sustainable in a small village.</p> <p>Traffic generation to and from the site will be of significance to the village. Offham village is a rat run for Kings Hill and other areas travelling to and from the A20/M26/20 intersections. At both morning/evening peak times there is a constant stream of traffic along Teston Road and the proposed site entrance is at a particularly point in the road where traffic speeds up leaving the Village and tends to speed into the Village before breaking heavily before the bend just past the proposed entrance. Vehicle movements from 20/43 more houses entering/exiting Teston Road would have a detrimental impact on traffic movements through the Village in addition to the added dangers of the location of access at this site.</p> <p>Site 59648 – White Ladies Site, Teston Road – 17 houses There will be a solar farm on the adjacent landfill site which would have a direct impact on any properties built at this location. Currently a power station associated with the landfill is still operating in the south section of this site (see below).</p> <p>Gas risk - The landfill site is still active with respect to ground gases, still with occasional elevated methane (and CO2) and the exact migration pathway for the gas is uncertain. Our Parish Council has not seen satisfactory evidence of safety regarding gas and noise within any current planning application.</p> <p>Gas utilisation/electricity generation compound to south of site Residents at the Aldon Lane/Teston Road junction and in the Aldon Conservation area report regular audible noise</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>emanating from this equipment (350 - 500 metres) at night with the prevailing south westerly wind. Any residences at a distance of 50 metres from the equipment is likely to be substantially affected while the equipment is in place.</p> <p>Highway safety The site lines are not perfect because of a slight curve in the road to the east. There are dangers present from the westerly approach, dangers of which Offham Parish Council and the local County Council member are well aware. This is an unsafe location for new houses to exit onto Teston Road.</p> <p>There is a speed unrestricted bend of some 35-40 degrees which is at the westernmost end of the White Ladies site and at the end of a 700 metre straight. Sight lines are limited. In early 2020, following concerns expressed, near miss etc., KCC Highways erected yellow warning signs either side of the bend as a warning of this bend.</p> <p>The yellow background emphasises that one should pay particular attention to the warning information the sign is trying to convey; they are used to give you extra warning in accident-prone spots.</p> <p>The distance of visibility eastwards for vehicles approaching from the west, from the bend to the proposed gateway is 100 metres. Conversely a distance of 100 metres from the current gate eastwards is a straight line and even with the slight curve, the visibility is much better than the western approach with the bend.</p> <p>Vehicles are warned with the signs but many take the bend at speed. Our concern is that for vehicles exiting from the proposed gateway position this will create even more dangerous situations than leaving the gateway in its original position. Moving an exit closer to the bend is more dangerous than concerns about sight lines in the other direction.</p> <p>Cllrs are concerned that this land is unsafe for residential development and contains contamination.</p> <p>Site 59649 – Teston Road at NE edge of landfill site – 9 houses</p> <p>This is immediately adjacent to the edge of a landfilled quarry site, the stability and consistency of the land being quite uncertain, in addition to its risk of gas migration. Access is immediately on to an unrestricted road just outside the village gateway. It will also be coincident with or extremely close to the access roadway into the proposed solar farm site.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42718561	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42720833	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees :</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons :</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This is a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2.3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Well Borough Council local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter open, semi-rural, low-density character of North Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722209	Question 8	<p>Developments along the A26 from Maidstone through to Tonbridge Wells including: 59597, 59624, 59655, 59624, 59664, 59726, 59728, 59799, 59803, 59806, 59845, 59599, 59729, 59742, 59805, 59816 all suffer with major access issues. The A26 is already close to capacity and links with other main route such as the A20 and M20 are poor. Hermitage lane runs past the Maidstone Hospital and will require a major development to ensure access to the hospital is not compromised. Seven Mile lane already suffers with significant heavy transport between the motorway system and Paddock Wood and is a regular accident blackspot. The cross roads in Watlingtonbury is already over capacity and causes significant delays at peak times. Developments to the south of Kings Hill and to the east including: 59424, 59544, 59861 impact upon significant green spaces and begin to merge the Kings Hill development with Watlingtonbury Barming and other villages fundamentally changing the character of the area in a detrimental way. Similarly 59740 then also merges Kings Hill with West Malling, East Malling Larkfield and Leybourne also making a significant impact on the character of the area, In addition the development 59597 near Yotes Court is not a Brownfield site and contains a significant area of agricultural land. Development 59816 cannot be considered as fair access band. Other developments nearby effectively accessing the same roads and junctions such as the cross roads between Mereworth road and seven mile Lane are consider poor. This development also fundamentally changes the nature of Mereworth and the surrounding villages Development. Application 59749 and 59750 will have a huge impact on the area around Mereworth. The infrastructure is at breaking point with the West Malling road and Seven mile lane requiring major development to enable them to carry the additional capacity with any degree of safety.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721697	Question 8	Ref 59789, this site sits between recreational land and the backs of many houses and gardens on The Freehold, which enjoy uninterrupted views, air quality, sound and natural light. This land is not only agricultural, supporting biodiversity but also contains a stream. Road access is currently very limited and the space is popular with dog walkers and those who enjoy walks. All of the above would be severely impaired should development be planned for this site.	Comments noted.
42593281	Question 8	<p>These relate to the sites north of Tonbridge known as Grange Farm and Greentrees .</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to the development of these sites for various reasons ,</p> <p>They were not included in previous development plans as they formed (and still do !) a vital part of the metropolitan green belt They consist of agricultural land , confirmed in an earlier report . Which in the present situation (Ukraine War) is like killing the goose that lays golden eggs . As a resident of Cuckoo Lane i am aware of the flooding issues which occur regularly , It will impact peak period traffic on the A26 already seriously strained with proposed Tunbridge Wells in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which will use Tonbridge as a Rat Run Further development will have an effect on the wild life in the area . Further development will seriously alter the character of north tonbridge from semi rural . As previously mentioned putting additional strain on local medical services and education facilities . Further impacting the town centre and generating more a larger population in an already stretched community . These sites are not easily and safely accessible , with no footpaths or lighting . Pedestrian and cyclist use case traffic problems already and limited passing places with restricted heavy traffic gives an indication of existing problems . Extra volume traveling to shops ,schools and health care must also become part of any future plans .</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723713	Question 8	<p>Site: 59592</p> <p>We live adjacent to this land and, up until recently, took care of it as leaseholders, and wanted to update some of the appraisal findings. The main points relate to protection of the biodiversity and flood risks associated with the site.</p> <p>This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains protected species of newt.</p> <p>The clay like soil and run-off from land up-hill results in a lot of water running through the land and collecting in the lake. During peak periods of rain, the run-off from the lake and the land ends up on Tonbridge Road, overwhelming the drainage and contributing to the flooding of the lower lying areas like Brookmead.</p> <p>This land is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes.</p> <p>There are also many large mature trees and wooded areas that provide a habitat for the wildlife and act as a barrier for the water run-off from the fields above.</p> <p>The local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) are already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby school and GP surgery and crowded buses at peak times.</p> <p>Tonbridge Road is the main thoroughfare into Tonbridge and is already v. busy at peak times and comes to a complete standstill regularly.</p> <p>Site: 59808</p> <p>We also live adjacent to this land. Most of the points above apply to this land as well (it has a water body and lots of water run-off, as well as mature trees supporting biodiversity and the same lack of capacity in local infrastructure) but it also has public footpaths and is used by a lot of Hildenborough and Tonbridge residents for good health and well-being, particularly dog walkers, and this has increased markedly over recent years. This green area would be a considerable loss were it to be developed.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723777	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42735841	Question 8	<p>sites 59441, 59442, 59443, 59445, 59456</p> <p>I can only speak for the area in which I live but I vehemently object to development on the above sites in Leybourne. I chose to live here because of its green spaces and the open feel of the development. There is a lot of wildlife on Leybourne as well including foxes, owls, woodpeckers, hedgehogs, which use these green spaces and our wooded areas. I do NOT want to see Leybourne becoming like the monstrosity of Kings Hill. Green space is good for mental health and I and many others enjoy walking in our green spaces and enjoying nature. The GP practice is not fit for purpose for the residents who already live here (not open regularly, poor small facility) and we already have to go to Kings Hill surgery more than we should. The public transport out of Leybourne is abysmal and since I have lived here services have been cut. I used to commute to London and there has NEVER been a bus service from Leybourne to West Malling Station for early commuting to work. This is not the area to add more houses on because fo the above issues. I cannot speak for schooling but can imagine the local primary is full. Where do the extra children go to school? How can the GP surgery take any more families? No no no to any new housing on lovely Leybourne.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42736577	Question 8	<p>The approach to call for sites before a plan is agreed has been a charter for everyone with a piece of land to suddenly see the opportunity for development, no matter how inappropriate or protected the land. Only once a suitable plan ie urban focus and minimal greenfield land focused around existing urban developments (strategy options 1 and 2) is agreed should a call for sites be entertained. Sites 59770, 59720, 59871 and 59872 are wholly inappropriate for the area as they are not in urban areas and are in green belt. In particular site 59770 which is for mixed use is completely inappropriate for the location. The open green space is part of the character of the location and particularly important for maintaining the rural feel to this location. The sites are all in an area of very heavy traffic onto the A25, opposite or near the primary school, and there are already numerous crashes or near misses with the existing traffic moving onto/off the A25 from side roads. Bus stops and services such as school within 400m are mentioned however the actual availability of these services is very much in doubt, in particular buses which at current levels certainly could not be used successfully in place of cars. Any development at these sites would inevitably lead to substantial increased car usage - this is a key reason why development should be focused on existing urban areas to reduce the necessity for additional car journeys.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42734561	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42740897	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Green trees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42713697	Question 8	<p>The methodology used fails to assess the infrastructure requirements of larger sites such as that at 59830 Borough Green Garden 'City'! The 'sites' which make up this particular proposal will need significant infrastructure development and service upgrades that appear not to have been taken into account within the assessment process.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746081	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42436193	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42471425	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42750113	Question 8	Multiple sites are on flood risk areas and should not be built on.	comment noted. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment considers all forms of flooding.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722881	Question 8	<p>I agree with the the Sustainability Appraisal Report where it correctly identifies 4 out 23 Hildenborough sites as being less sustainable, namely 59669, 59783, 59798 and 59801.</p> <p>Site 59745 is clearly developable as are the nearby sites of 59823, 59801, 59609, 59625, 59835, and 59804 as they are beside other built up areas and will not affect the flooding issues in Hildenborough</p> <p>Site 59679 should clearly not be developed. A planning application was recently submitted for this site and was not recommended for development by the planning officer. The comments on this site were as follows: The Local Planning Authority acknowledge that the contribution of 76no. dwellings would contribute to housing supply within the Borough, which currently stands at 3.17 years. The conclusions reached regarding level of harm and the heritage balance as required by paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) are disagreed with. The heritage benefits proposed, including the repairs to the building and landscaping improvements, would not greatly mitigate the harm caused by the combined impact of the new school buildings and whilst they are significant, they are not reliant on this scheme. It is concluded that there are no public benefits arising from the proposed scheme in the context of paragraph 202 of NPPF, which would outweigh heritage harm as set out.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42607329	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42752033	Question 8	Individual Site Assessment (Annex 1) has not been reviewed in detail - no comment on this Question.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42760257	Question 8	<p>59685. 59690. 59693. 59721. 59805. 59809</p> <p>The Grange Farm and Grentrees areas are subject to flooding. Roads in this area are already congested and are frequently used at peak times to avoid congestion on the A26. Development in this area will put further strain on overstretched local services and cause more congestion.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42361345	Question 8	<p>Offham is a village with many historical connections. There are three conservation areas: Offham Green, Offham Church and Aldon; an 11th century church and 37 listed buildings.</p> <p>Site 59406 - Barfield House (20 Houses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and scope of the development not sustainable, nor appropriate, given the size of and locality to Offham. • The project sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham. • The project would lead to a material increase in traffic through the village, adding to pressures on roads already at capacity given the type of road and locality. • The location of the project makes vehicle access potentially dangerous due to the way in which vehicles would be required to pull out onto a fast road without clear line of sight. • The increase in traffic would almost certainly lead to a degradation of air quality within Offham. • Offham bus service is being removed as KCC funding withdrawn. No communication elsewhere by public transport will now exist. • The size of the project would put extra pressure on existing infrastructure - such as sewers and power networks. • The size of the project would put extra pressure on essential public services - e.g. doctors' surgery, and local schools. <p>Site 59596 - North of Site 59406 (23 Houses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and scope of the development not sustainable, nor appropriate, given the locality to Offham. • The project sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham. • The project sits within the zoned metropolitan green belt with the site being adjacent to ancient woodlands. and is thus inappropriate for development. • The project would lead to a material increase in traffic through the village, adding to pressures on roads already at capacity given the type of road and locality. • The location of the project makes vehicle access potentially dangerous due to the way in which vehicles would be required to pull out onto a fast road without clear line of sight. • The increase in traffic would almost certainly lead to a degradation of air quality within Offham. • Offham bus service is being removed as KCC funding withdrawn. No communication elsewhere by public transport will now exist. • The size of the project would put extra pressure on existing infrastructure - such as sewers and power networks. • The size of the project would put extra pressure on essential public services - e.g. doctors' surgery, and local schools. <p>Site 59648 - White Ladies (17 Houses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and scope of the development is not sustainable, nor appropriate. • The project sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham. • There will be a solar farm on the adjacent landfill site which would have a direct impact on any properties built at this location. Currently a landfill associated power station still operates in a section of this site (see below). • Gas risk - The landfill site is still active with respect to ground gases, still with occasional elevated methane (and CO2) and the exact migration pathway for the gas is uncertain. Offham Parish Council has not seen satisfactory evidence of safety regarding gas and noise within any current planning application. • Gas utilisation/electricity generation compound to south of site: <p>Residents at the Aldon Lane/Teston Road junction and in the Aldon Conservation area continue to report regular</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>audible noise emanating from this equipment (350 - 500 metres) at night with the prevailing south westerly wind and also by day . Any residences at a distance of 50 metres from the equipment is likely to be substantially affected while the equipment is in place. (Current as of 3.11.22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Highway safety: Site lines are not perfect because of a slight curve in the road to the east. There are dangers present from the westerly approach, which Offham Parish Council and the local KCC member are well aware. This is an unsafe location for new houses to exit onto Teston Road. There is a speed unrestricted bend of 35-40 deg. which is at the western end of this site and at the end of a 700 metre straight. Sight lines are limited. Early 2020, following concerns expressed, near misses, KCC Highways erected yellow warning signs either side of the adjacent bend. ● The project site is contaminated and unsuitable for building due to the risk of gas leaks from the landfill site. Any housing within this project site is likely to be impacted by noise pollution from the utility generator to the south of the site. ● Offham Parish Council is very concerned that this land is unsafe for residential development and contains contamination. <p>Site 59649 - Teston Road (9 Houses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The nature and scope of the development is not sustainable, nor appropriate, given the locality to Offham. ● The project sits outside of the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham. ● The project would lead to a material increase in traffic through the village, adding to pressures on roads already at capacity given the type of road and locality. ● The location of the project makes vehicle access potentially dangerous due to the way in which vehicles would be required to pull out onto a fast road without clear line of sight. ● This site is immediately adjacent to the edge of a landfilled quarry site, the stability and consistency of the land being quite uncertain, in addition to the risk of gas migration. ● Access is immediately onto an unrestricted road just outside the village gateway. It will be coincident with or extremely close to the access roadway into the proposed solar farm site. <p>Sites 59699, 59714, 59716, 59594, 59645 - strongly opposed because of these are sites of prime agricultural land in the green belt.</p> <p>Sites 59602, 59603, 59733 - not supported as will inappropriately 'fill in the gap' and connect Kings Hill and West Malling communities.</p> <p>Sites 59807, 59860 - not supported. Too close to historic village of West Malling and strongly opposed.</p>	
42720801	Question 8	<p>The following sites have been earmarked in Hadlow:</p> <p>59605, 59635, 59637, 59638 59647,59686, 59776, 59842, 59853, 59857,59601, 59811, 59859, 59410</p> <p>The village does not have the infrastructure (doctors, schools, road congestion) to support these sites being developed. Not only are some of these sites green belt, but some would also have a negative effect on the environment.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42765793	Question 8	<p>Ref: 59779, 59825 and 59827. All these sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. Shipbourne is vulnerable to development: Upper Green Road is already heavily used and heavily parked upon, the latter especially on weekends. This makes it at times impossible to give access to the locals, who have to back up their car for 20 to 30 cars parked along the narrow road. The area around the school has not enough parking to provide a safe picking up of children as it is, let alone with 38 more households on a confined doorstep. There is no shop in Shipbourne or any other amenities. Everyone would have to drive to Tonbridge or further afield for their shopping and work. This would make all roads but especially the A227 through the village even more dangerous than it is.</p> <p>Amenities of gas, electricity, water and internet would have to be extended to accommodate any new housing. Gigaclear is the provider of fibre optic cables to a limited number of households. Connectivity for internet and mobile phones is not ideal as it is.</p> <p>These developments would totally change the atmosphere of this quiet backwater which at the moment has not more than 275 dwellings.</p>	<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.</p>
42770017	Question 8	<p>I do not agree with the methodology used in this study . Eg the Borough Green Garden site which is a huge are is treated as one are and what may be appropriate for one end is not for the other. Ticking a box for a primary school is inappropriate when 3000 house will require provision of a further school, GP surgeries new roads etc.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42726305	Question 8	<p>59637 - This site is designated as Green Belt and is unsuitable for development. A footpath passes through the middle of the site and development would have a significant negative effect on users. There are important views of Hadlow tower across the site from the cemetery where there is a Grade 2 listed war memorial. Development of the site would detract from this viewpoint and the openness of the Green Belt as well as adversely affect the tranquility of the cemetery. The site is also prone to flooding and provides important natural flood attenuation to the surrounding areas. The site is also graded agricultural land the loss of which could impinge on the agricultural economy and the rural character of the village. Access to the site from Cemetery Lane is unsuitable for the residential and construction traffic that would be generated by development. Cemetery lane is narrow and would be overwhelmed by traffic if any development were to proceed. It is already a 'rat run' at peak times and can be dangerous. Development that causes additional traffic generation should be discouraged. The site is not well connected to the village services and there is no safe cycle or pedestrian route. Finally, the site acts as an important habitat and significant loss of biodiversity would occur should development be permitted. 59638 - The junction of the access road with the A26 is dangerous due to visibility and speed of traffic. The location of the site next to the pond would impact water quality of the pond and associated wildlife. The site is Green Belt and in agricultural use. Development would adversely affect the rural setting of the pond and the surrounding trees. There is no safe cycling route to Hadlow and Tonbridge beyond. 59686 - Same comments as for 59638 above. Also, Hadlow Medical Centre is oversubscribed with no room for expansion. Large scale green field development in the village will add pressure to the medical centre and other public services. It will also overwhelm existing infrastructure. 59605 - This site is green belt and any development is inappropriate. An unlawful residential development has been undertaken to the site which is the subject of enforcement action and an appeal. The unlawful development should be a material consideration in any decision over its future allocation. Development of the site resulted in destruction of habitat, and any allocation should seek to re-establish this to repair damaged biodiversity. The site is not well connected to the village and access to the site is unsafe on highways grounds given the closeness of the A26 junction.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42754753	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88. All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead) significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead. The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808 This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road). The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved.</p> <p>All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity). Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowded during peak times. A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times.</p> <p>With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban!</p> <p>As we have seen with the recent developments in Hildenborough (Oakhill, and Hlyden Heights) they are developed and promoted to non locals increasing the population by default. With an ever increasing population through out of city transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42757505	Question 8	<p>Please explain your answer and quote the individual site reference</p> <p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772865	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88. All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead)</p> <p>significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead. The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808 This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road). The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency</p> <p>to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved. All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity). Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowded during peak times. A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times. With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban! As we have seen with the recent developments in Hildenborough (Oakhill, and Hlyden Heights) they are developed and promoted to non locals increasing the population by default. With an ever increasing population through out of city transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be</p> <p>sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772897	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88. All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead)</p> <p>significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead. The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes. Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home. Site: 59808 This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road). The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services). Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency</p> <p>to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved. All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity). Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowded during peak times. A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times. With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban! As we have seen with the recent developments in Hildenborough (Oakhill, and Hlyden Heights) they are developed and promoted to non locals increasing the population by default. With an ever increasing population through out of city transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42774273	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. and education services. increase. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 10) The drainage is not up to the capacity of dealing with any further development. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42774945	Question 8	59720,59608,59871,59793,59709,59872,59770,59830, are either precious AONB or GB.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42775905	Question 8	<p>Many sites are overly intrusive development in areas of the Green Belt and AONB without any realistic infrastructure in place to support them.</p> <p>Distance to bus stops and railway stations does not correlate with greater use. Many roads are unsuitable to accomodate additional traffic, which also impacts climate change further.</p> <p>Site 59608 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59830 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59793 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59872 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59770 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59709 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59871 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59720 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59794 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42780929	Question 8	<p>Site ref: 59596 the land to the south of the site now benefits from planning permission for 7no. dwellings. This approved development now sets a precedent for the bringing forward of this site for development. The site would be able to deliver up to 10 units, within what has been demonstrated as a sustainable site with an already approved access.</p> <p>Good quality development is achievable within the site as high quality designed buildings would be deliverable.</p> <p>Careful, landscape led design, would allow the surrounding rural countryside to be protected and respected, with the layout responding positively to the sites context.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. Comments on specific planning applications are Development Management matters.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42784385	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42775553	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42774817	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42774849	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746401	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42790529	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes No</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42796353	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42776897	Question 8	<p>Site 59617 & 59703</p> <p>This site is a green belt site outside the village envelope of St Mary's Platt. The access from every direction is wholly inadequate to support any development whatsoever.</p> <p>Due to a lack of car parking for the existing properties in the area, the main access road, Potash Lane, is frequently congested.</p> <p>Any residential development on this site would block the view from, and the view of, our property, The Barn, which is a Listed building. There are number of listed houses in the immediate vicinity and it is a conservation area.</p> <p>In the local plan 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 it is stated that areas of green belt should not be used if at all possible and the heritage sites should be preserved. Therefore this small area should be removed from the list of potential development areas.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42638369	Question 8	<p>This is where we move from the strategic - to which the site assessments are directed - to the particular. At the strategic level there is little room for debate, because of necessity the assessments have to be generalised. Refer to my answers to Q2 and Q4.</p> <p>An aside: Site 59493 appears to be Borough Green Station Car Park. If so this makes no sense as the Car Park is undersized as it is - see below. Brief comments on particular aspects of the larger sites near Platt follow.</p> <p>Site 59839, the former "Garden Village", is totally out of scale for Borough Green. Sites 59877, 59748 and 59843 are more or less contiguous and together cover 17 ha on which 374 houses would be built - plots of 455 m2 or 21m*21m. Site 59703 is 0.7 ha with 20 houses - plots of 350 m2 or 19m*19m. Also out of scale. Q4 answer very much applies here.</p> <p>Some infrastructure issues to amplify Q4:</p> <p>Road Capacity: The A25 is already a chain of bottle-necks from Wrotham Heath to Bessels Green. Development on this scale would exacerbate this congestion, and that on the A20 and A227. The J5 Slips and the Borough Green relief road are essential contributions to reducing existing congestion, leave alone that generated by new housing.</p> <p>Public Transport: Rail and Bus services are failing to cope with demand, and the BGW station car park is full to overflowing. Provision of additional capacity would be essential.</p> <p>Air Quality Pollution: levels in Borough Green in 2014 were high enough that an Air Quality Management Area had to be declared; this should limit development. The traffic generated by development on this scale would increase pollution levels, and adversely impact public health.</p> <p>Supporting and Social Infrastructure The early construction of such services as electricity, gas, water, telephone/broadband, schools, medical and social facilities would be essential.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42362881	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42799905	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42794209	Question 8	<p>Our site is Ref 59666. However there are several other sites that are close to us e.g. Ref 59702 and right next door and Ref 59826 relates to a further large area to the north, west and south of Eccles. If the development of Eccles was considered overall then our site would not be within a Poor Accessibility Band and it would be possible to envisage a creative and exciting major development opportunity for the Eccles area. If this was carried out with the correct approach, including a sympathetic understanding for the beautiful surrounding environment, it would be possible to plan a major development for the area which would provide both high quality and affordable housing with an appropriate mix of sized, types and tenures as well as new communal facilities and new employment opportunities. Looking at an area as a whole rather than by site can change the perceptions relating to each site. For example, from our site it would be possible to access the nearby motorways without traffic going through the village so a business park could provide employment without causing congestion in the village. Easy access to the AONB could be a hugely positive aspect for people living in the area if access was managed in a sensitive manner.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802017	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
25384001	Question 8	<p>I do not agree with the methodology used by this study. For example the Borough Green Gardens site is treated as a single unit spatially. In reality it is 5 different quarries all at different stages of quarrying. There is no point in ticking a box twice because part of the site is close to a station if the other end of the site is miles away. There is no point on ticking a box because there is a local school when it is obvious that an extra 3,000 families will need multiple new school forms and huge infrastructure that's currently not present.</p> <p>It would be far better to make a serious attempt to quantify the infrastructure required, including an end to end 'Relief Road', and estimating costs it in order to determine if the proposal is even viable.</p> <p>Can a road be built in time given that the quarries keep extending their time horizon to complete quarrying?</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802945	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42440705	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42803201	Question 8	<p>I refer to sites: 59624, 59631, 59654, 59664, 59700, 59726, 59728, 59797, 59799, 59803, 59845, 59723, 68729 All sites referred are located in or on the outskirts of Wateringbury and I believe any development of these sites will be detrimental to the people who already live there and the local environment for the following reasons: Wateringbury is a village with around 800 dwellings, any development over just a handful of dwellings will significantly change the identify of the village as a country / rural place. The village is not well served by public transport and the consequent use of the A26 is excessive with queues often stretching back past the church one way and to Teston in the opposite direction. The crossroads is already highly polluted and is currently running at 24% above capacity. Developments in any of the sites above will inevitably increase traffic through the crossroads (or towards East Malling with the inevitable bottle neck by the railway bridge) or via Teston village with its narrow road leading down to the A26. In addition, developments in both Maidstone and Paddock wood also bring additional traffic along the A26 It is also important to note that the village sees on average 1 or 2 blue light ambulances every hour heading between Maidstone and Pembury Hospitals. Bow road is extremely narrow and often single file due to on road parking for houses without driveways. Ambulances are frequently held up trying to get through the village, increasing the traffic due to any expansion in residences in the village will inevitably increase this problem. The GP surgery is already unable to accept any new patients and the village school is not of a sufficient size to accommodate a huge influx of new pupils. Secondary schools are either in Maidstone, Paddock Wood or Tonbridge with no dedicated school buses. The village has just one very small general store forcing people to travel, usually by car, to larger shops several miles away. Wateringbury has always been a rural village and despite the large volume of traffic currently using the roads, it maintains many of the qualities of a village. substantially increasing the size of the village will grid lock roads, increase pollution and destroy what is left of the village identify.</p> <p>I would also refer to sites 59636 and 59740. Both of these sites are currently arable land and it is an absolute travesty to even suggest that this precious green space which is highly fertile and capable of being cultivated to provide much needed local food, should be concreted over. The size of the site is huge and will dwarf existing clusters of homes, turning a rural habitat in to a concrete jungle with zero infrastructure, no public transport links, no shops within walking distance, quiet lanes clogged up with cars, no facilities to deal with sewage, no GP surgeries, already over utilised hospitals. The council should, in my opinion be setting valuable arable land aside as a means to try and ensure reduced food miles feed in to reduction in pollution and sustainability targets</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.
42803169	Question 8	<p>Site 59758 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Significant impact on borough's landscape and townscape character. should be opposed to preserve agricultural land and prevent urban sprawl/merging of settlements. Site 59759 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Agricultural use should be preserved. Significant impact on borough's landscape and townscape character. Should be opposed to prevent urban sprawl and merging of locales. Site 59760 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Agricultural use should be preserved. Site 59797 - Terrible impact to local setting. No infrastructure or access. Agricultural use should be preserved. Site 59755 - unsafe access to facilities mentioned. Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Site 59757 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Site 59749 - unsafe access to facilities mentioned. Terrible impact to local setting. Site 59750 - No space at school. Impact to greenspace. Site 59752 - Terrible impact to local setting. Agricultural resource should be preserved. Site 59754 - unsafe access to facilities mentioned. Terrible impact to local setting. Site 59425 - access constraints. Disagree with distance to public transport. Site 59594 - significant impact on biodiversity and geodiversity, not uncertain. Significant impact on borough's landscape and townscape character which has heritage value. Site 59597 - no space at school. Hardly brownfield land, huge impact on bio and geodiversity. Site 59598, preserve agricultural land. Site 59861 - preserve agricultural resource. Site 59624 - huge impact on local greenspace. Disagree with distances as realistically site is remote. Site 59631 - as previous. Site 59636 - huge impact on local greenspace. Disagree with distance to station as realistically site is remote. Site 59698 - as previous. Site 59799 - huge impact on local greenspace. Site 59802 - huge impact on local greenspace. Site 59806 - agricultural use should be preserved. Site 59811 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Site 59824 - Terrible impact to local setting. No infrastructure or access. Site 59740 - should be opposed to preserve agricultural land and prevent urban</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		sprawl/merging of settlements. Site 59816 - should be opposed to preserve agricultural land and retain local vernacular.	
42807073	Question 8	<p>There are too many potential sites in Hildenborough, which is problematic for a number of reasons.</p> <p>1) lack of infrastructure - GP surgery is exceptionally busy already, schools are at capacity. there is only one real food general store (one stop).</p> <p>2) lack of transport options - it's virtually impossible to get around other than by car. It's difficult to walk to the train station and the bus provision is very poor</p> <p>3) flood risk - Hildenborough is at significant risk of flooding, even with the Leigh bund (yet to be built). A lot of these sites are flood plains and so that reduces the run off areas and affects the properties that are being proposed.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. All forms of flood risk are considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42817185	Question 8	My answer refers only to Grange Farm and Greentrees form part of the MGB and are very productive agricultural land	comment noted.
42784705	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, lowdensity character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38330945	Question 8	<p>Site 59610 Residential: Park Road Addington – The Parish Council would have no objection to the development of this site subject to an air quality report. The Parish Council has supported previous planning proposals for additional homes on this site. Site 59628 Residential: Millhouse Lane Addington – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site as we feel it would represent overdevelopment in a conservation area. Site 59725 Residential: Ford Lane – The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site. Although we would be concerned about the loss of this site as a leisure facility and the tourism it brings to the area we feel it would be a good site for affordable homes given its proximity to the road network and bus service. There is an ancient woodland to the north of the site which would need to be protected. Site 59850 Mixed Use: East of Addington Village – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We would not welcome the loss of this well-maintained grassland. We feel that any further development in this area would destroy the openness which would be harmful to the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. The proposed entrance to the site is also very narrow and steep and in our opinion not suitable for vehicles. Site 59812 Mixed Use: A20 Clearways Addington – The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site and feel it could work as a mixed-use site. We would welcome affordable housing on this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 59830 Mixed Use: Borough Green Garden City, Borough Green, Wrotham & Platt – The Parish Council is concerned about the fact that Borough Green will lose its identity and be swamped by this development. We are concerned about the effect on the infrastructure and the impact this will have on our village. The proposal would undoubtedly result in an unwelcome increase in traffic and pollution in Addington. We recognise that this site could provide some housing but feel it should be on a smaller scale. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42821985	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. <p>Yes No</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42828769	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42822305	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42832129	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42754337	Question 8	<p>They are not proper site assessments and there are far too many sites for anyone to properly consider more than a handful of them in 6 weeks even if they fully understood the criteria.</p> <p>I am a fully qualified property professional with 45+ years' experience, including 20+ years dealing with front end development issues including site assessments, feasibility studies, site assembly, master planning and obtaining planning consent on some very large, complex and highly sensitive sites. It took me four and a half 16-hour days, just to skim through the pertinent documents and track down the information relating to Tonbridge Town Centre and Hildenborough alone. The lack of an index to the sites and a plan showing the proximity of the Hildenborough sites in to each other was unhelpful to say the least, and I can't help feeling that this was deliberate on the Council's part in an attempt to hide the true extent of the proposals that would impact the village.</p> <p>I have looked specifically at the 22 (or thereabouts) individual site assessments relating to Hildenborough alone and every one of those merits its own individual commentary, and that is before looking at the potential cumulative effects of the proposals on the village (which is the most important aspect and a subject in its own right!). To put the magnitude of this into context, it would take me and a team of highly skilled professionals at least 6 weeks to just scope the extent of the work involved, and then between 3 & 6 months to carry out the work and report the findings.</p> <p>Given the magnitude of the proposals for Hildenborough, all of this work will need to be done properly before publication of the Regulation 19 Plan and within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years) to comply with NPPF 22. My own view is that this should be done in conjunction with Hildenborough Parish Council, and with the respective outputs then informing the production of a Neighbourhood Plan for Hildenborough that would sit alongside the Local Plan.</p> <p>In the meantime, I would be prepared to identify the deficiencies with the existing Hildenborough & Tonbridge site assessments for you if you give me more time and undertake to cover my reasonable disbursements.</p>	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42818337	Question 8	<p>With regards to sites 59779, 59825, 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reference to a minor positive of being in close proximity to a primary school is misleading. Shipbourne Primary has only capacity for 59 children (and usually the year cohorts are full) and the site cannot be extended to build larger classes due to lack of space. - References to proximity to a bus stop need to allow for the fact that bus links are extremely infrequent in Shipbourne and hence a car is essential to travel. Also, the closest train station is 3miles (Hildenborough) and hence only accessible by car, therefore adding to greenhouse gas emissions. - There are no comments regarding the very small roads and hence limited accessibility and congestion that dense housing on these sites would cause 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42613985	Question 8	<p>59820 REJECT-planning has already been submitted for this</p> <p>51819 ACCEPT</p> <p>59784/59832 REJECT current planning application in place, includes recreation ground impact on community facilities</p>	Comments noted. comments on specific planning applications are Development Management matters.
42834017	Question 8	<p>59890, 59805, 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721</p> <p>These sites form a vital part of the green belt.</p> <p>Development will worsen already congested roads.</p> <p>It will put a strain on healthcare providers and on education.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42834689	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42803713	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42834945	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42730593	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities, etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42835169	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42835233	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. and education services. increase.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42835361	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42834785	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the North of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Green Trees:</p> <p>-59685 -59690 -59693 -59721 -59805 -59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2. They consist of productive, BMV, agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3. They are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4. Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. 5. Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6. Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi rural, low density character of North Tonbridge. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42016897	Question 8	The Medway gap as is rebounded needs to be left out of any further plan until local services have caught up GP appointments are a good example hanging on for hours on the phone to be told no appointments please try again tomorrow which incidentally never comes.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42044577	Question 8	See above	Comment noted.
25390689	Question 8	Borough Green Garden City - loss of Green Belt and AONB are not acceptable in terms of Climate Change and Natural Environment. Evidence from Bird Track, ID Butterflies, Kent Reptile and Amphibian Group and Medway Biological Records.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38779009	Question 8	I would like guarantees that amenity land - playgrounds, greens, playing fields - is not designated for housing.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.
42080737	Question 8	<p>1,410 are being promoted for possible development between the rural communities of Burham and Wouldham.</p> <p>Given that Peters Village has recently been built between the two, and another huge development planned for Eccles (with the traffic exiting via Burham), it would take this one document to be put forward to obliterate all the rural communities in this area in one planning move.</p> <p>Some of these developments are suggested on the best and most versatile farming land, and others in flood areas highlighted in the same doc. Most are also in view of the AONB.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42166369	Question 8	Again, the finding of the surveys are extremely lengthy and unclear. Perhaps these surveys should be communicated in clearer ways so that people already living and working in the area can understand them. Or perhaps they're shared this way precisely so that there are minimal readers and therefore minimal objections?	Comment noted.
42167937	Question 8	None of these sites should be approved until sufficient pressure is placed on central government to work hand in glove with the borough to develop infrastructure. Otherwise residents will be placed in developments devoid of any services to the detriment of their mental health and the development of their offspring.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42192673	Question 8	Because does not make rail and public transport central	Comment noted.
38606561	Question 8	I am opposed to further development in these areas	Comment noted.
42202241	Question 8	The majority of sites have inconclusive findings where it may or not be beneficial	Comment noted
42171937	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. <p>Detailed comments on each site's SA can be found in my separate comments on ANNEX1.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42197217	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42255521	Question 8	Appendix D related to objective and not individual sites. Unless the question is asking for something different. I would expect there to be a map etc with noted locales on it.	Comment noted.
42255873	Question 8	No new developments	Comment noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42035937	Question 8	<p>Site ref: 59791, 59792, 59787, 59818, 59784, 59819</p> <p>The high concentration of potential sites within the Aylesford and North Downs Ward is unacceptable due to the inadequacy of it's infrastructure, lack of public transport, medical facilities and local schools. In almost all of these potential sites, the only road in and out of the villages is the totally inadequate and dangerous dual carriageway on Rochester Road.</p>	Comment Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
25045889	Question 8	Do not understand it.	Comment noted
42322369	Question 8	See answer to Q7 above.	Comment noted
42328449	Question 8	The findings are ridiculously complicated. They are hidden in a referenced document which is over 250 pages long. They are pretty much impenetrable to me without setting aside several hours of study.	Comment noted.
42350689	Question 8	Until the infrastructure of the existing borough is sorted further expansion is ludicrous. The health service, roads, schools etc. are at breaking point. Who will benefit from further housing? Not the people of the borough but the companies who undertake the new developments.	Comment Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
25315361	Question 8	<p>Sites 59702 59790 59826 59847 are rated as being within 800m of health care facility. The facility will be displaced to Peters village before the Plan takes effect.</p> <p>Sites 59702 59666 59826 59790 59841 59768 59831 are rated as being within 400m of a bus stop but the bus service is now only 2 busses a week.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42391041	Question 8	<p>Quite simply the proposal for there to be 1400+ new homes around Burham means that the findings cannot be taken seriously.</p> <p>It will destroy wildlife, farmland and the rural community.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42430081	Question 8	<p>What a number of these do not take account of (they key sited listed below) are the noise pollution from 4 roads and motorways by replacing trees/hedges with buildings. and the increased traffic pressure as well as towns/villages losing identity as they are swallowed up/become one large urban area and resulting in residents of those areas not having the opportunity to enjoy the rural locations (bridle ways, country footpaths etc)</p> <p>cfs refs: C60cbc d10f6c d98dob f1b1c7 c7ba47 d5a33c and site IR (no ifs ref available): 59488</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
25100225	Question 8	can't understand it	Comment noted
42438753	Question 8	Please see previous comment for all green field sites.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42440097	Question 8	<p>Site 59748: this area has no direct road access. Any new road would have to come through residential roads already heavily used and would cause further congestion in the area.</p> <p>The Woodlands Estate is in front of this proposed development and any development would be extremely detrimental to this estate as the main access would probably go through the Reynolds Retreat/Harrison Road exit or Doctor's Surgery/Reynolds Retreat entrance. Traffic would then access the A25 via Quarry Hill Road which is not built to take the traffic already using it.</p> <p>We know from the Hazlebourne development that people will not use the Haul Road down to the A25 Darkhill roundabout, they turn left to use Quarry Hill Road as a short cut.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42444129	Question 8	<p>No - many of the sites are unsuitable due to poor access, lack of transport and health care. Some of the green belt sites in Mereworth are totally unsuitable being located along single track country lanes. We have already seen the impact of the former Tatham site in Willow Wents which had no site access or parking. This resulted in large lorries travelling a single track lane, causing significant damage and unloading in the road, blocking it for long periods of time causing disruption and potentially stopping emergency vehicles getting through. Contractors vehicles had to park in Butchers Lane creating problems for local residents and other delivery vehicles, There are insufficient parking spaces resulting in congestion elsewhere. Access onto the B2018 Seven Mile Lane is unsuitable as is the A26 and A228 sites. There would need to be a reduction in the speed limits on these roads and roundabouts and traffic lights, all of which would cause congestion. There would need to be new GP surgeries which are already under pressure as are the 2 hospitals at Maidstone and Pembury, mostly due to acute staffing shortages and national NHS vacancies of over 100,000. There are not the extra staff to cope with the increased demand in patients.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42446049	Question 8	<p>Appendix D does not show the details of the individual sites, just the criteria to be used to assess them. Paragraph D6 relating to healthcare is yet again totally unrealistic in relation to healthcare. Current GP surgeries are overwhelmed in West Malling and Kings Hill, and to assume that building more houses near the surgery means that new residents will be able to access healthcare is naive. More GPs, nurses and receptionists will be needed together with increased funding for drugs. How will these be funded?</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42447265	Question 8	There is such a large volume of information here and not all of it is correct.	Comment noted.
42443169	Question 8	<p>Site 59800: this site is part of the green belt and forms part of a nature conservation area and borders ancient woodland, impacting on the bio diversity of the area. The development would result in the loss of a local facility ie the golf course, having a detrimental impact on local employment and the health of the local residences. Egress from this site can only be back into restrictive roads within Kings Hill or detrimentally impacting the quiet lane of Cannon Lane which itself egresses onto the busy A26 at a blind corner. This is also a site of aquifers and streams and within the last 12 months has suffered from a sinkhole.</p> <p>Site 59797: this site is part of the green belt and forms part of a nature conservation area and borders ancient woodland, impacting on the bio diversity of the area. The development would result in the loss of a local facility ie the golf course, having a detrimental impact on local employment and the health of the local residences. This area provides access to the countryside and has a number of public rights of way that were maintain when the golf course was established. This would represent a loss of amenity not just to local golfers but also walkers and dog walkers. It is heavily patronised by the local residences and would. We would lose agricultural land into the bargain when we are aware we need to be more resilient in our food availability, This is a substantial development and would place damaging impact on already stretch health services in the area as well as the local infrastructure.</p> <p>Site 59761: this would result in the loss of ancient woodland, canopy cover and open space impacting on wildlife. This would result in the loss of a rural business and employment. The local infrastructure in the form of the A228 would be adversely impacted which is already under pressure and subject to change to improve the safety of the road in this area owing to the volume of traffic.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42461121	Question 8	<p>59830: Previously Borough Green Garden City and rejected by government - far too large a development would destroy local settlements.</p> <p>59493: BG Station car park will need more space not less if more homes built.</p> <p>59492: Western Road car park - essential village resource.</p> <p>59877: Inadequate access.</p> <p>59748: Inadequate access.</p> <p>59843: Off single track lane - impractical.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42471041	Question 8	<p>I cannot find appendix D.</p> <p>I am disappointed to to be able o give specific feedback on areas.</p>	Comment noted.
42471617	Question 8	n/a	Comment noted
42473025	Question 8	59720 59871 59709 59830 59608 overdevelopment in Greenbelt and AONB email with specific details to follow.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42476673	Question 8	<p>Canon Lane Site 59800</p> <p>Canon Lane is an historical, and in most parts, single track lane rising approximately 60 metres to the north where it terminates against narrow woodland and the housing boundaries of Kings Hill. It is bounded in its lower half by extensive traditional stone walls on either side of the narrow lane which date back several hundred years. Its junction with the Tonbridge Road provides limited visibility and has, we understand, seen fatalities.</p> <p>The lane is popular with walkers and cyclists from Kings Hill and the surrounding area, meeting footpaths to both the East and the West at its higher level and providing at the northern end pedestrian access to Kings Hill.</p> <p>Amenity. The site adjoins the north-western part of Canon Lane and comprises land forming part of the Kings Hill golf course, an important sports amenity for the existing Kings Hill Estate and local area.</p> <p>Access. Canon Lane is not capable of providing safe access to any further housing developments along its length. As noted above, it is single lane in the most part, heavily frequented by walkers and cyclists, including unaccompanied school children, and has a dangerous exit on to the Tonbridge Road.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how access to this proposed site can be achieved without obtaining additional rights of way from Kings Hill by demolishing houses on that estate to establish a roadway. Canon Lane itself is entirely unsuitable for higher volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Water table. During the summer of 2022 the small lake shown on the site plan drained, caused, we understand, by a sinkhole which had opened up. This has affected the water table flowing down parts of the hill side leaving empty a further large pond downstream in the water infrastructure which had existed for over a hundred years or more. Subject to expert advice, any further housing developments on the higher reaches of the lane (either this site or site 59802 to the east) could have further effects on the natural flows of water with potential adverse consequences.</p> <p>Site 59802</p> <p>Amenity values and landscape of character. Site 59802 comprises well managed vineyards and, until recently, productive agricultural fields which have been set aside for reasons which are unclear.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>To the north it bounds and provides footpath access to Cattering Woods which we understand are a protected area. To the south it has exceptional views across miles of beautiful countryside, woodlands and hills providing a landscape of great character. These views would also be significantly damaged by development of the possible sites in the area of Pizien Well on the opposite side of the valley.</p> <p>The footpaths that cross the proposed site provide attractive walking routes to the north, east and south and are heavily frequented particularly by residents of Kings Hill. If these footpaths are eliminated with new build, the recreational walking areas available to these residents in this local area will be constrained largely to a single narrow footpath around the perimeter of the golf course to the west. The farmland comprising this site provides an important amenity for the encouragement of mental well-being and exercise, and access to the natural environment with its wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>With climate change, the well managed recent development of vineyards on this site has provided an attractive alternative use of the farmland bringing sustainable employment opportunities. Vineyards provide an important agricultural evolution for the region with a growing economic contribution to the County, including local tourism, and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The loss of such an outstanding site to the community, to the local character of this part of the Kentish countryside, and the growing evolution of its agricultural contribution and example, would have significant impact.</p> <p>This land should be protected as one of the treasures of the area.</p> <p>Access. Canon Lane does not offer a safe or appropriate access. In addition it is not clear how access from the east can be secured without cutting through Cattering Woods which are protected as ancient woodland and should be left unharmed.</p> <p>Water. The comments above apply so far as they concern the water availability, water table and possible pollution.</p> <p>3. Pizien Well area. Sites 59799,59624, and 59723.</p> <p>The fields and woods comprising the Pizien Well area provide an attractive country setting of historical note. Its few houses are well tended and in the lower parts form a beautiful settlement of cottages around the waterways. The original medieval village which gave rise to the development of Watringbury is believed to have existed here and its original market was established here in the 14th Century. Foundations of previous dwellings still exist in the woodlands. The few houses in Pizien Well are served by single track lanes.</p> <p>(i) Amenity and the character of the landscape. The Pizien Well area, including Site 50624, contains numerous heavily used, popular footpaths serving communities in Watringbury, Pizien Well and Nettlestead.</p> <p>Site 59624, which is situated on high land, comprises valuable and productive farmlands with exceptional views to the north and east, and having important footpaths to the east, west, north, and south. It forms the character of this landscape which would be destroyed by development and blight the excellent southerly views from the land on the opposite side of the valley near Kings Hill on and around Site 59802.</p> <p>Site 59799 would result in the destruction of the attractive and well-tended setting containing the existing cottages comprising Pizien Well Lane.</p> <p>Any development in this area would destroy the character of this beautiful landscape, eliminate valuable, productive agricultural land and access to this natural environment for the health and well-being of the community, and would have a heavy impact on biodiversity and animal life.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42457825	Question 8	Again cannot make sense of it	Comment noted.
42469569	Question 8	Not suitable to extend building in Watlington, due to very high pollution at the village centre cross roads	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42443201	Question 8	The BG Garden City has no funding for a Relief Road. Developers have to prove the site is financially viable, but the cost of remediation, road, infrastructure, and lack of any coherent plan to fund the road make this whole site unviable. There is no provision for a Secondary School, therefore children will need to be driven/bus/train to remote towns. Borough Green has ongoing sewage issues. The medical centre is operating at maximum level. Bus provision has been severely cut.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42491169	Question 8	Undecided - need more information	Comment noted.
42496417	Question 8	No cannot make sense of it	Comment noted.
42514209	Question 8	Do not feel qualified to answer	Comment noted
42520801	Question 8	This is NOT user friendly. I cannot comment on a document that I have not seen!	Comment noted.
38330881	Question 8	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
42536801	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825 and 59827 are all wholly unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <p>All three sites are within the green belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how "to conserve and enhance natural beauty" in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000.</p> <p>Shipbourne Conservation Area and the Shipbourne Design Statement make clear how damaging development would be to the village and to the AONB. The rural charm of Shipbourne and the tranquil beauty of the fields in and around the village are a source of pleasure and solace, not just to people living in the area, but also for the many people who come to Shipbourne from further afield to walk, cycle or simply rest their eyes on the rural landscape.</p> <p>The infrastructure is not in place for any of the Shipbourne sites (59779, 59825 and 59827). There are no shops in Shipbourne, no doctor's surgery, a very restricted bus service and only one very small primary school which is already oversubscribed, and the roads are too narrow and dangerous to cope with the traffic, let alone the pollution to the AONB. The costs to rectify all of this would be too high to warrant the building work.</p> <p>The road junctions between Back Lane and Reeds Lane and between Back Lane and the A227 are already dangerous. Adding more people and traffic to the mix would be hazardous.</p> <p>There are land drainage issues in and around Shipbourne and the sewerage is already under too much pressure, with overflows repeatedly reported by villagers. The water systems are not up to the job of handling the existing population, let alone an increased population.</p> <p>Shipbourne is not on the gas network so the electricity grid would need to be upgraded.</p> <p>Specifically to each of the three Shipbourne sites:</p> <p>Site 59827:</p> <p>- This site is Kent Downs AONB, Green Belt and connected to the Conservation Area.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>- Anyone walking through Shipbourne woods and the local public footpaths will gaze across this field to rest their eyes on the unspoilt rural landscape. The fields between the woods and Back Lane and Reeds Lane are especially beautiful and an integral part of the AONB.</p> <p>- There are serious land drainage issues on this site. The neighbouring houses have long complained of sewage overflows. A watercourse runs along the southern boundary.</p> <p>- Reeds Lane is particularly narrow and dangerous (and has severe drainage issues). It already can't cope with the existing traffic. To add housing (and the resultant traffic) to this area would be irresponsible.</p> <p>- The junction between Reeds Lane and Back Lane is dangerous, with a narrow blind bend shortly after this junction on Reeds Lane.</p> <p>- The pollution caused by any building work, additional homes and the resultant traffic would inevitably cause harm to the AONB.</p> <p>- This site has been identified in Para 5.41 of the Sustainability Appraisal as being a least sustainable site option for allocation.</p> <p>Site 59825:</p> <p>- This site is Kent Downs AONB, Green Belt and within the Shipbourne Conservation Area.</p> <p>- Building on this site would ruin the picturesque charm of the village.</p> <p>- This is a very open site.</p> <p>- The access onto Upper Green Road (which is narrow and treacherous, particularly in winter) and Back Lane is dangerous</p> <p>- There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne, so no need for mixed development.</p> <p>Site 59779:</p> <p>- This site is Kent Downs AONB, Green Belt and on the edge of the Shipbourne Conservation Area.</p> <p>- The site is on a very dangerous junction between Back Lane and the A227. Moreover it is opposite Shipbourne Primary School, and any added traffic would be a danger to children at the school, especially at pick up and drop off times.</p> <p>- The bus stop on the A227 only provides a (very restricted) school service.</p> <p>- There is poor drainage on the southern boundary of this site.</p> <p>- There is an active covenant on this land restricting development.</p>	
42541281	Question 8	Sites in Addington are not sustainable - especially site 59850 East Street - it says within 400m of a bus stop - but the buses hardly ever run, and the bus service (58) is under treat by KCC of being stopped as no one uses it as it is so slow - it takes over an hour to get to Maidstone as it takes a rural route. The buses are not 2 an hour (as per national standards for sustainability) - also the train station is about 3 miles away in west malling. The sites are not sustainable.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42544705	Question 8	I am not an expert and I do not wish to comment on whether or not the findings are correct however what I cannot understand is why Eccles is being allocated such a large amount of development which is not proportionate with other areas. It has terrible transport links, a railway station which is not accessible easily by bus. It is a good half an hour walk away. The bus service was nearly stopped this year and is a very limited service. We have no medical services nearby, the medical centre will move to Wouldham, which will not be sufficient to cover so many surrounding villages,	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42550785	Question 8	Sites 59797 / 59800 - cannot believe that the golf course has been listed here. Local amenity. Green belt land. Community asset. Open space. Used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders etc. It's loss would be an abject failure to safeguard residents well being and health.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42556065	Question 8	<p>59720, 59871, 59793 and 59709 - the access to these sites is severely compromised. The proposed development will lead to significant congestion at the Borough Green roundabout and on the A25 and Borough Green Road. This area is already gridlocked at rush hour. Has anyone even been to look at the build up of traffic between 7.30 and 9am and between 3.30 and 6pm?? The consequential increase in air pollution is extremely concerning and there is a significant public health risk. Increased traffic through the village of Ightham will also impact the integrity of the numerous listed buildings, many of which are positioned very close to the road. Where will the children from these new houses go to school? Ightham only has one small village school which lacks capacity for more pupils. 59608 - Ismays Road is a narrow country lane. It cannot sustain the increased level of traffic which will result from building 37 houses (never mind the construction vehicles!) 59770 - Rectory Lane is another narrow country lane. Access to the already busy A25 will be increasingly difficult. Sometimes it takes several minutes to drive out onto the A25 from these side roads and accidents are very commonplace. Building in areas such as this will only increase congestion and occurrences of accidents. The above potential sites must also been seen as a whole and not just individually as many of these sites are adjacent to each other and therefore the impact of development is far more acute. We are looking at more than 270 new houses in a village!</p> <p>59830 - this is the most worrying and potentially damaging of all the plans. A huge development which is totally unsustainable. The infrastructure is simply not there and the impact on the local community, wildlife, local services, traffic congestion and pollution is unimaginable.</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.
42562465	Question 8	<p>Site 59407: Small site with existing houses so likely to be over developed.</p> <p>Site 59492: This is an essential village carpark. Building here woulddisplace cars onto the congester highway.</p> <p>Site 59493: This is an essential station carpark. Building here woulddisplace cars onto the congester highway.</p> <p>Site 59877: This is a unique site of historic importance and character. It should be preserved in its current form and not over developed.</p> <p>Site 59880: I beleive this is Green Belt</p> <p>Site 59881: I beleive this is Green Belt</p> <p>Site 59712: I beleive this is Green Belt</p> <p>Site 59748: There is insufficient road access for the proposed size of this development. The character of the local area would suffer.</p> <p>Site 59794: Access to the road would be impossible.</p> <p>Site 59830: Over development on AONB and Greenbelt land. Insufficient bus & rail links, non-existant relief road, insufficient schooling and medical services, questionable land quality due to landfill sites.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42546721	Question 8	<p>59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869</p> <p>These sites fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>Access to these sites will severely increase an already difficult traffic access issue.</p> <p>Furthermore there has recently been substantial development in the old Fidelity business site and the development of a new large care home. These recent developments will add additional stress on the social care medical care and educational requirement which are already struggling to cope</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42583457	Question 8	Because the sustainability will not be met	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
39011745	Question 8	<p>No. The assessment is not balanced and does not cover overall impact. Two easily identified examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on car parks in West Malling does not consider the impact of loss of those resources on local businesses and the vibrancy of the village, or impact on access to the rural hubs, e.g. for local businesses in Kings Hill that need to provide accommodation for visiting staff, or residents accessing libraries or post offices or the myriad of different small shops in the area. • Building on Hoath Wood has been designated as Brownfield, even though much of the area is Ancient Woodland protected by TPO (for which unlawful action has been reported to TMBC but no response has been received). As such, the validity of the assessment is severely at doubt. <p>Site 59424 DEFRA Forest Inventory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees • Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill • Harm to protected species • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Impact on Local Residents of main access • Impact on wildlife corridor <p>Site 59531 Change of character of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space • Soak-away area for local roads; removal will result in more flooding <p>Site 59534 Change of character of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space • <p>Site 59544</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Harm to non-listed heritage assets, preservation order • <p>Site 59547</p> <p>Loss of Green Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • <p>Site 59630</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59631</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Public Open Space for Kings Hill • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59634</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Ancient Woodland and TPOs (Most of site) • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59655</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59740</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Inadequate resources – KCC indicate suggested school location not economic, no retail centre <p>Site 59752</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>Site 59761</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland (Part of site) • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>Site 59797</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59800</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59802</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59884</p> <p>Example reasons for objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42585633	Question 8	<p>Assessment is not balanced and does not cover overall impact, placing the validity of the assessment in severe doubt e.g. building on car parks in West Malling does not consider impact of loss of these resources on local businesses and vibrancy of village or the other local hubs, building on Hoath Wood has been designated brownfield when much of it is Ancient Woodland protected by TPO's</p> <p>Site 59424 DEFRA Forest Inventory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees • Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill • Harm to protected species • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Impact on Local Residents of main access • Impact on wildlife corridor <p>Site 59531 Change of character of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space • Soak-away area for local roads; removal will result in more flooding <p>Site 59534 Change of character of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space • <p>Site 59544</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Harm to non-listed heritage assets, preservation order • <p>Site 59547</p> <p>Loss of Green Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • <p>Site 59630</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59631</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Public Open Space for Kings Hill • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59634</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland and TPOs (Most of site) • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59655</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59740</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Inadequate resources – KCC indicate suggested school location not economic, no retail centre <p>Site 59752</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>Site 59761</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland (Part of site) • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>Site 59797</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59800</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59802</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59884</p> <p>Example reasons for objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42499585	Question 8	<p>If this question does not relates to potential sites identified for potential development in Borough Green, Wrotham and Ightham then please can you attach the comments below to the correct section of the consultation.</p> <p>With reservations the following applies:-</p> <p>Ismays Road 59608 - 37 dwellings:- impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Dark Hill Farm 59709 - mixed use - impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Gracelands 59720 - 198 dwellings - impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Rectory Lane 59770 - mixed use - impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Gracelands - 59871 - 28 dwellings - impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Borough Green Road 59793 - 4 dwellings - the wishes of nearby owners need to be upheld else they may suffer great upheaval and may suffer mentally. They may feel they have to sell up and move away from a home that they loved. Existing owners should not feel that they have to move else where because of a new development.</p> <p>Borough Green Garden City - 59830 - 3000 + dwellings. Huge negative impact on biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational. TMBC has a safeguarding duty to existing residents to protect open areas, especially greenbelt. Loss of open space is not good for mental health. A development of this size and scale</p> <p>Ightham Bypass -59872 - 3 dwellings - Feelings from nearby home owners need to be upheld.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42587521	Question 8	I have yet to meet anyone who thinks the proposed changes are acceptable and realise this is an exercise being completed at the behes of central government	Comment noted.
42587585	Question 8	we don't have time to go through every site in this time limited way but will add comment son specific sites as our answers progress	Comment noted.
42588385	Question 8	No the whole report is not sustainable there is a big enough population all ready.	Comment noted.
42589153	Question 8	59534 Site , it is proposed to build 18 houses on this site, how is parking going to be arranged, how is road to access to these houses located, how is this not blocking the view of existing home owners of Woodford grove, how is this not destroying the green space which is currently being enjoyed by the residents of Woodford Grove?? How is this not affecting the house price of existing home owners, who is going to compensate them for it? How is additional 18 houses going to solve any housing problem?? With 5000 houses in the plan, how is this 18 house contributing to it, why is this green space needed for building houses, is there no other space that house can be built. I found the idea of building 18 houses in site 59534 ridiculous, impossible to understand, not solving any problem, adding numerous problems for existing residents nearby, if you could explain to me why you think this is a viable idea, i am open to hear.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42591265	Question 8	59745 is green belt, has large number of large protected trees. Is a wildlife link to other area, would create issues of privacy and noise issues to existing residents. It would add further traffic to the already over busy B245 road which is the diversion route to the A21 which is closed regularly. B245 floods at junction of Hilden Ave during heavy rain this would be made worse is this area is built on due to further run off going down the hill. This area should be shown as having many serious negatives.	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42612225	Question 8	<p>Sites 59797 and 59800 - development of these 2 sites would materially affect the King Hill Golf Course and bridlepaths, with significant detrimental impact :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the loss of golf, walking and cycling recreational facilities and employment opportunities - the loss of historic woodland, agricultural land - impact on varied and rare wildlife - the golf course is an agreed amenity from the original development of Kings Hill more than 25 years ago 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42615649	Question 8	<p>59691: Agree with site assessment, not sustainable</p> <p>59840: I do not agree that the whole of this site qualifies as brownfield land. The eastern part of the site has derelict buildings and structures that is brownfield land and is appropriate for development. Parts of the remainder of the site were subject to landfill that has now blended into the landscape and sustains wildlife. Development of this site would also be highly visible within the AONB.</p> <p>59708: The questions do not seem relevant to small developments. In principle a small development is possible however there are issues such as access over private land, safety due to a popular village preschool and the widely accessed public footpath.</p> <p>59863: Agree with site assessment, not sustainable</p> <p>59864/66: Part of this site is within Birling although it is not acknowledged in the consultation. The site is adjacent to an area of Special Scientific Interest, highly visible from AONB and is Grade 2 farmland."</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42616257	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42616897	Question 8	<p>Site 59827 (and adjacent sites 59825 and 59779)</p> <p>All in the Green Belt and AONB area and adjacent to the Shipbourne Conservation area. Watercourses run along the southern and eastern boundaries and floods regularly occur. The ground is predominantly clay and often waterlogged. The local sewerage pumping station is already struggling to cope. Back-flow of surface water and effluent over my driveway and garden (which is adjacent to Site 59827) occurs at times after heavy rain due to the inadequate capacity of the pumping system currently in place. (It happened today 3/11/22 just to prove the point!)</p> <p>As it is, the sewer/drainage system requires significant improvement to accommodate outflow from potentially 30 more people occupying three sites already approved along Back Lane/Reeds Lane. Unfortunately, there has been no acknowledgement of this need for an improvement in the equipment despite my objection during the planning process. If any further development should take place on any of these adjacent sites a major upgrade of facilities would be needed.</p> <p>Adding more traffic to these narrow local roads would significantly increase the likelihood of accidents and injuries. It would also completely change the character of Shipbourne as a desirable, picturesque rural asset.</p>	<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.</p>
42635873	Question 8	<p>Call for land 59745 is of particular interest to me as I live in Oaklands Way and that site sits directly behind my house. I was under the impression that there was a restricted covenant on the land but there are constant requests for planning on that site. I strongly object to the development of that land along with numerous other identified sites in the Hildenborough area. Our infrastructure is already creaking at the seams and the Fidelity site is already being developed putting further pressure on the road infrastructure, the medical services and schools. We simply can't take any more housing here. I'm obviously also concerned with the privacy access as the site is on a slope so any building would directly affect our privacy at the back.</p> <p>The removal of trees that were supposedly dangerous on the land have already caused flooding issues to the bungalows at the end of the cul de sac in Oaklands Way, and above all it's another big green space of working arable land that would be destroyed.</p>	<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.</p>
42641409	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779 / 59825 / 59827 are each based around Back Lane in the village of Shipbourne where I have lived for 29 years. I note that site 59827 has been identified in Paragraph 5.41 of the Interim Appraisal Report as being among the least sustainable for allocation. All 3 sites are in the Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB and 59825 is in the Shipbourne Conservation Area (the other are adjacent) so development is contrary to broader government policy. Challenges to developing these sites include: dangerous junctions at both ends of Back Lane; the bus stop mentioned in 59779 is only used at school times; with no gas in the village the electricity grid would need to be upgraded; current sewage and water infrastructure is inadequate for this scale of development.</p> <p>The Appraisal says there is uncertainty on there being sufficient capacity in the existing school to support the implied increased demand. There is no uncertainty, the existing school is already oversubscribed and squeezed onto a small site with no room for development. Consideration of these sites should assume a new school would be required.</p> <p>Sites 59779 and 59825 are described as too small to accommodate a mix of housing. If this implies only providing 4/5 bedroom executive homes (as is common in this area) I do not see how this addresses the TMBC housing need. It is more likely simply to attract in migration from outside the Borough.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42652417	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, , 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the SVE objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42657345	Question 8	<p>SITES 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59835</p> <p>These sites are overlapping and are all on vitally important green belt land that is of great value to the local community. Access to the sites would involve overloading the roads through Willow Lea and Shipbourne Rd or destruction of protected ancient woodland. This should mean that this site is not considered for development. Horns Lodge Lane is a public footpath and it is used by many local residents. Any development would significantly detract from the enjoyment of walkers (and others) - especially as the first part of the path is the most accessible for elderly locals.</p> <p>59804 includes a private road, a public footpath and parts of privately owned housing plots. The fact that this site has been allowed to be submitted shows the lack of thought and consideration that has gone into the whole call for site and assessment process.</p> <p>Site 59801 has already been classed as “Unsuitable” for development. Nothing has changed in the interim period, so why is it included. It also is part of 3 other suggested site.</p> <p>There are a number of protected pipelines that run through these sites, which should preclude development in their vicinity. I believe there is a high pressure pipeline that runs through Site 59735 with a protection order banning digging foundations in the area. Also, not mentioned.</p> <p>Development of any of the above would be damaging to the local environment and community and should not be considered further.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42643873	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>For my comments on these sites please see my separate comments on the ANNEX1 SA Appraisals.</p>	
42649601	Question 8	<p>59750 and 59752 - far too large a development. Current roads (A20 and A26) already very congested with frequent stationary traffic at peak times. Would end up with Mereworth losing its identity</p> <p>59806 - housing numbers far greater than any of the surrounding villages so would change the whole character of the area. Hugely detrimental on biodiversity, air quality, increased demands on transport</p> <p>59624/59723/59799/59722 - too far to walk to local school, particularly due to dangerous nature of roads to walk along. Too distant from shops/facilities. Would need car to live in this location. An area rich in biodiversity which would be lost</p> <p>59797 as above comments plus would cause Wateringbury to lose separate identity from Kings Hill, impact detrimentally on air quality and greater transport/water/education demands</p> <p>59729 too large an impact on the size of Wateringbury, loss of biodiversity, increased congestion on over congested roads</p> <p>59654 - too few number of houses for area</p> <p>59803 negative impact traffic on over congested roads</p> <p>59800/59802 loss of identity Wateringbury from Kings Hill/ access issues</p>	
42544353	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42230369	Question 8	<p>A systematic and sequential approach should be taken to the assessment of all sites in the Green Belt. I suggest four stages in that consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Can the release of the site for development be avoided? 2. If not, is the release proposed the minimum necessary? 3. Can the (minimum) loss be mitigated - for example by on site measures? 4. Can the loss be replaced (for example by equal provision elsewhere)? <p>Sites 59747, 59749, 59750, 59806 and 59811are (among others) in the gap between Kings Hill and Hadlow, and should be avoided for development. The SAR does not recognise sufficiently the "gap" function as an important arm of National Green Belt policy. Site 59811 is also an important Listed Building with local importance to its parkland setting.</p> <p>Site 59842 is too small and isolated from the boundary of Hadlow to warrant site-specific identification. Any proposals there should be initiated (and dealt with) through the normal development control process. This and other northward extensions of Hadlow (both to the east and west of A26 should be assessed against sustainability criteria (currently absent) that take account of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The character, appearance and functions of Common Road (which is an attractive and well-used entry point to the Bourne Valley and the AONB, and for important agricultural traffic from housing development) and of Cemetery Lane (which has similarly limited traffic capacity and serves additionally as the "processional route" to the village cemetery, demanding a measure of quietude). If development is to be permitted adjacent to Lonewood Way and for sites further along Common Road to then west, they should be served from an existing access directly to A26(designed and built by KCC some years ago, but not currently used) 2. the hazardous junctions of both Common Road and Cemetery Lane with A26. Common Road would benefit here from a "right turning entry lane" from A26 and both would benefit with a slower speed limit on their approaches. 3. the dangerous bends at the junction of Common Road and Matthews Lane and Carpenters Lane, both of which should be re-aligned, and the many dangerous bends and accesses already existing along Cemetery Lane. 4. The need for safer crossings to the bus stops serving both Common Road and Cemetery Lane. <p>None of these factors figure in the SAR</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42683265	Question 8	<p>59881 No</p> <p>Reasons. Not connected to a settlement the site is on rising ground and will dominate the surrounding rural area. The location is not sustainable, distant from an established settlement, public transport and local amenities.</p> <p>The development would damage heritage assets including the protected park and the setting of a number of listed buildings for which an isolated rural or parkland setting is key to their significance.</p> <p>The development would be a huge hole in the Green Belt with no mitigating circumstances.</p> <p>The development would significantly contribute to more car traffic on quiet rural lanes before adding to the existing congestion on the A26.</p> <p>59601 No</p> <p>Reasons. The site is in the flood plain of the River Bourne and is regularly flooded. Development would restrict the natural capacity of the land to cope with run off and will lead to more serious flooding down stream.</p> <p>The site is beyond the established village boundary and would intrude into a key view of the tower and the village from the A26, which is cited as important for the character of the village and would damage the setting of the listed building. It is important for the character of the village that this hard south west edge remains and is not absorbed by suburban sprawl.</p> <p>The site had ecological significance with habitat for a number of protected species along the river edge, including water voles and dormice.</p> <p>Development of the site would add further traffic to the congested A26 corridor.</p> <p>69859 No</p> <p>Reasons. The site is in the flood plain of the River Bourne and is regularly flooded. Development would restrict the natural capacity of the land to cope with run off and will lead to more serious flooding down stream.</p> <p>The site is beyond the established village boundary and would intrude into a key view of the Maltings and the village from the A26, which is cited as important for the character of the village and would damage the setting of the listed building. It is important for the character of the village that this hard south west edge remains and is not absorbed by suburban sprawl.</p> <p>The site had ecological significance with habitat for a number of protected species along the river edge, including water voles and dormice.</p> <p>Development of the site would add further traffic to the congested A26 corridor.</p> <p>59776 No</p> <p>The site is currently a field utilised in conjunction with the adjacent sports field by the village hall as much needed outdoor amenity for the village families. In rural areas paradoxically, public open space is in short supply compared with urban areas, as no particular provision is made for parks or amenity spaces and the surrounding land is private and cultivated, so this is a valuable resource. It would also provide the only suitable location for a new school to meet the needs of new housing.</p> <p>Any development of the site will add more traffic onto Carpenter's Lane, already too narrow for existing parking and traffic. The junction to the A26 is dangerous and the A26 is already too congested.</p> <p>59842 No.</p> <p>Reasons. The site is prone to run off flooding and is unsuitable for residential development. If it is developed the run off will flood elsewhere in the village.</p> <p>The location will add traffic stress to Carpenters Lane and the junction with A26 which are already unable to safely cope with existing traffic. It will add to the congestion on the A26 and further damage the air quality in the centre of the village.</p> <p>It extends a significant distance north of the settlement into the Green Belt and would be an incongruous intrusion into this rural area, as well as being unsustainably too far from amenities.</p> <p>The development would prevent any future Northern by pass to allow traffic to be taken away from the centre of the village. The pressure of new development along the A26 is particularly damaging for Hadlow which is the only major settlement on the key route between Tonbridge, for the A21, and Kings Hill, for the M20, which is having a disastrous impact on living conditions within the settlement, with congestion, noise and poor air quality. The only way to prevent the further degrading of living conditions in Hadlow would be by provision of a bypass.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>59638. No. Reasons. The site is prone to flooding, unsuitable for development and further restriction of run off would raise flood risks up stream. Development of the site would damage the setting of a listed building. A26 access on the bend would be dangerous and add to the existing congestion and pollution on the A26 corridor and in the centre of Hadlow.</p> <p>59637 No. The site is an unacceptable and incongruous extension of the settlement boundary into the Green Belt and would damage the rural setting of surrounding lanes. It would add considerably to traffic along the narrow Cemetery Lane which has a tight access to A26 with limited forward visibility and be dangerous for residents and passing traffic. Part of the site is prone to flooding and any development would restrict natural run off, increasing flood risks. Development of the site would damage the isolated rural setting of a listed building.</p> <p>59686 No. The site is back land, without direct highway access, and so relies on other sites. It will add to the congestion and pollution on the A26 through Hadlow.</p> <p>59647. No. The development would add considerable traffic and congestion to Court lane, a narrow country lane, unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, and with a difficult tight junction to the A26. The development will take suburban strip development a long way beyond Hadlow into the rural area to the east, with a detrimental impact on the Green Belt. The development will add traffic to the already congested and polluting A26, through Hadlow and into Tonbridge.</p> <p>59635 No. A planning application has already been submitted and objections have been placed on the unreasonable loss of rural character, inappropriate design, impact on the setting of listed buildings, loss of ecological habitat and traffic and congestion</p>	
42687265	Question 8	See above	Comment noted.
38354465	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871,59793,59709,59872,59770,59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbeltAONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42691361	Question 8	Reports do not adequately assess each site. The full impact of the AONB are not considered. The assessment of BGGC cannot be viewed as a single site. The site cannot be viewed in isolation it must be viewed with all other sites which fundamentally the community (schools etc) cannot support.	Comments noted.
42707873	Question 8	No - it makes no sense	Comments noted.
42715777	Question 8	Too much focus on just building on farm land. Where are the brownfield site classifications. These should be mapped and prioritised for regeneration and development.	Comments noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42637441	Question 8	<p>No - I think a lot of the Tonbridge sites will just cause more problems with traffic management and air quality. Traffic itself is a nightmare around Tonbridge.</p> <p>In the North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by the proposals in that area will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>Also some of the Tonbridge sites are taking away amenity open spaces for our communities which are regularly used for sport, exercise etc which all support the mental well being of the local communities being able to get out and about and engage in nature.</p> <p>None of the sites identified on the green belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42696769	Question 8	Sites must be assessed to meet the economic and ecologic needs of our county. Any large residential development in a rural location fails to meet the strategic needs for a viable long term local plan.	Comment noted.
25205729	Question 8	<p>Based on my own knowledge I have concerns about the following 3 sites:</p> <p>59661 59701 59834</p> <p>These sites push the settlement boundary of Tonbridge east into the Swanmead/ Postern Lane area. This area is popular with walkers, runners and cyclists and is a well used recreational area for the town. I also believe the area is subject to extensive flooding and some is designated as Green Belt. The residents of Postern Lane commissioned a report on site 59701 as part of the last Local Plan process. We therefore have more specific details about that site which I will submit as a comment to the Sustainability Report - Annex 1.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42718497	Question 8	<p>Building on St MARTins Square 59457 is ludicrous. Where will people park to visit shops.</p> <p>Its a 1043 page report how can we plough through all of it.</p> <p>59460 - Disagree with building next to Cobdown - reduces green space.</p> <p>59464 - The current infrastructure in Teapot Lane cannot cope - why build more houses.</p> <p>59469 Holt Wood. is a green space and must not be developed. There is not enough access. Refuse.</p> <p>59852 - Too much development by Barming station already - refuse this.</p> <p>59861 - This is a green belt area behind Priory Park and should not be developed.</p> <p>59870 - Kiln Barn Road - Again green belt area should not be developed.</p> <p>59873 - Kiln Barn Road - - Not enough traffic infrastructure.</p> <p>59715 Hill Top Farm - Green belt and no access to roads. Refuse.</p> <p>59718 - Larkfield FC - this ios a sports ground - refuse.</p> <p>57980 London Road - increased traffic - refuse</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38333377	Question 8	There's not enough room here to provide all my comments on specific sites but here are general comments on sites in Hadlow. 1. All sites along the A26 will generate more traffic through the village and should not be considered before any sites closer to stations or Motorway junctions or in the established urban centres. The A26 is extremely busy through the village and it is heavily congested at peak times, contributing to poor air quality. 2. Particular sites requiring access along narrow country lanes or using tight junctions with limited visibility will cause unreasonably dangerous increases to traffic flows and endanger pedestrians and other road users. 3. The flood risk from flooding and run off should rule out some proposed sites, in particular to those in the flood plain of the River Bourne. 4. The medical centre is already oversubscribed and is not accepting new patients. Although the primary school is not full, there are limited places in each year group. 5. Heritage assets, listed buildings and registered parks and monuments have protection which goes beyond the immediate curtilage to include the setting. If new development damages the setting of the listed building or park, for example by changing an isolated rural location into a housing estate, then it should be turned down. In the case of Hadlow Tower or Oxenhoath, part of the character and setting are the key long views which would be damaged by many of the proposed developments.	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.
42719201	Question 8	Sites 59808 and 59592 in Hildenborough are in a area of Green Belt and can be only used for development in Exceptional Circumstances. There are no exceptional reasons especially as they are near the huge Fidelity development. As the village is in its settlement boundary this would threaten the boundary and teh anti-coalescence policy. Also Woodfield avenue is a narrow road and unable to cope with the additional traffic.	Comments noted.
42587169	Question 8	Site 59720 - the proposed plan for 198 dwellings is considerably larger than previous applications (e.g. nursing home, driving range) which were either withdrawn or declined. Any development on this land would need to be of a scale that is consistent with, and addresses, previous planning decisions. KCC recent culling of rural bus services, the increased popularity of white vans delivering home shopping and a road that is already a "rat run" would all drive greater vehicle use, with the consequent negative impact on the environment	Comments noted.
42721025	Question 8	<p>Sites 59550 and 59552 are adjacent play areas, one being a playing field the other a play ground. They are the only recreation sites in this area and one should be able to access green sites within 500m of home. It is unlikely that one site would be developed without the other. Yet their benefits are stated to be that they are close to a recreation area. If both are developed that would not remain the case.</p> <p>We believe there is a Covenant to prevent building on these Brindles Field play areas which has around 70 years remaining.</p> <p>In relation to the biodiversity in the area there are a variety of trees in this vicinity and a plethora of wildlife can be seen here which would be disturbed. The objective of an increase of 10% in biodiversity would not be aided if these are used but would be reduced.</p> <p>Residents in this area are not within the catchment area for the very popular Sussex Road primary school, hence there is an increase in the congestion around school run times. Brook Street has 3 schools and a college, 2 of which have pupils from far afield, many of whom drive themselves to the 6th form and college. Additional housing in this area will add to this congestion and pollution.</p> <p>The other sites in this vicinity would also have many of the same issues.</p> <p>In relation to the Haysden area development development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the area.</p> <p>I cannot register at a GP surgery within walking distance, nor a Dentist. Further housing in the area will create further burden.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42720161	Question 8	Some of these are agreeable e.g. 59390, 59391, 59393 why indicate a small area only. 59852 agreeable but why not the whole of the field? Where an identified site has exit to a country lane this, if anything but a small development, will cause further congestion on those roads. Looking at the number of sites and having spent a considerable time on it already I reiterate my prior thoughts. No agricultural land should be used, the infrastructure Must be a significant consideration, traffic especially on rural lanes and roads.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721569	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, Yes No 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from Tivial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516,</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721505	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic Tood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cutthrough traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42413313	Question 8	<p>59861 - Poor road entrance with poor KCC planning on the roads.</p> <p>Removing popular existing footpaths which enhance the public</p> <p>Damage to EMR land and restrict their ability to research. Chemicals used have been an issue in Ditton Edge project.</p>	Comments noted.
42721729	Question 8	<p>Site no: 59789</p> <p>Ancient Agricultural land</p> <p>Flood risk due to natural stream</p> <p>Area has limited services (GP, train station and limited bus services)</p> <p>Limited site accessibility</p> <p>Site is in a flood zone</p> <p>Limited access to mains services such as cable</p> <p>Removal of such green space would change the current residents and villagers air quality, sound and natural light.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42721185	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825 and 59827 should not have been included after the sustainability appraisal based upon the use of Green Belt and AONB.</p> <p>Further cause to eliminate these sites include, lack of services, lack of infrastructure, dangerous road conditions, erosion of the Shipbourne</p> <p>Conservation area, presence of an active covenant restricting development on the land included in site 59779</p>	Comments noted.
42443041	Question 8	<p>I will comment in the individual sites form in Appendix B. My main concern is that the appraisal seems to bear very little relation to the reality of the sites and in particular has over-weighted the benefit of there being a bus service within 800m of (a part of?) the site. In reality there is very little possibility of sustainable travel from villages such as Mereworth as there is usually a long walk to the bus stop, the buses don't go to e.g. the supermarket, and they cost a fortune: e.g. £6+ return fare to Tonbridge from Mereworth, children aged 5 or over cost half of this. It cost me £13.50 to travel by bus from Mereworth to Maidstone Hospital nearly 10 years ago, with 2 children; this is totally unaffordable and I have since had to go everywhere by car.</p>	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722529	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously allocated and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722785	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723649	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here:</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42436577	Question 8	See comments made against individual sites in my area (Borough Green).	Comments noted.
42589025	Question 8	<p>Site 59534, site 59531, and site 59884.</p> <p>We all understand more houses are needed to accommodate growing population, but there are loads of spaces between Kings Hill and East malling or Kings Hill and Waterringbury, these 3 popular small lawn areas are like big back gardens shared among the local residents, building houses on them won't add more weight to building plan, but it will take away relaxing green areas for locals.</p> <p>Especially site 59534, nicknamed by the children 3 hills, has been there for 20 years and is probably the most popular site for generations of children in Kings Hill on snowing winter days because of its shape. Hundreds of children will take sledges to this site to enjoy sliding on the snow. Building 18 houses there will cause more roadside parking and traffic problem on tower view and most importantly will take away the happy spot from the children in Kings Hill! Please don't do it!</p>	Comments noted.
42726913	Question 8	See comments on individual sites	Comments noted
42720513	Question 8	<p>Site reference nos: 59750, 59749, 59599, 59597, 59752, 59816, 59598, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59758, 59754, 59757, 59761.</p> <p>I have profound and well-founded objections to the proposals made for possible development sites within the village and its environs.</p> <p>The majority of the village is sited between the B2016, Seven Mile Lane and the A228, Malling Road. These roads are connected via The Street to the south (north of St. Lawrence's church) and to the north by Beech Road. All these roads have significant problems caused by traffic are not fit to cope with an increase in traffic volume.</p> <p>Any developments which increase the burden placed on these roads will seriously exacerbate congestion to a busy and dangerously narrow to the main north/south road for mid Kent. The parking problems caused in The Street, not only by Mereworth Primary School, have been ongoing for many years. The Street is regularly brought to a standstill twice a day, on one occasion in 2022 poor parking resulted in a delay of almost three hours.</p> <p>The infrastructure supporting the existing settlements in this area are woefully inadequate and over-stretched. During 2022 there were water shortages and drainage problems in Mereworth and the surrounding area. There are also semi regular power cuts, the reasons for which are unclear, but these would surely become exacerbated with further properties. Broadband coverage is also a problem with phone and internet speeds effected. This is an ongoing problem not even resolved on large residential estates in the area.</p> <p>There is a serious problem with the existing medical practice, covering Kings Hill, West Malling, Offham, West Peckham, Mereworth, Leybourne and the scattered dwellings in between. It is difficult to even get through to the GP practise by phone and virtually impossible to see a GP in person. Dentistry is no better served with no NHS dentists in the area having vacancies. The two hospitals serving the community, Maidstone and Pembury are also overstretched as is, from personal experience, the ambulance service.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>There are no secondary schools in the area which are accessible on foot requiring children to travel many miles by school bus and the very limited public transport service. In addition I believe the primary school in Mereworth is already oversubscribed and would not be able to accommodate even a fraction of children within the residential development suggested.</p> <p>Public transport from Mereworth is inadequate. Although a bus service does run to and from Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells it is, again from personal experience, infrequent and unreliable. There is no train station within walking distance, the nearest requiring a bus to get there. This is a problem for those without their own transport needing to get to places of employment and to shops, post offices etc. as Mereworth does not have such facilities.</p> <p>Sites for over 8000 dwellings are proposed for the wider Mereworth area; many of which are neither appropriate or feasible. The ingress and egress to these sites often involves single track lanes onto fast and/or congested roads which even without additional dwellings at present struggle to cope with the current levels of traffic. Breakdowns and shunts on the A228 and B2016 cause long delays and block the narrow village roads.</p> <p>It seems that only one of the sites identified appears to be on a brown field location, but even this is tenuous, the others being situated on green field and woodland. The development of these sites would greatly affect wildlife and biodiversity within the area. Several of the sites identified are also within flood zones and are presently used as agricultural land.</p> <p>Development sites under the present proposals would very effectively wipe out the village character of Mereworth, in some aspects becoming an extension to Kings Hill. The village was in the Domesday Book and has sites of significant historical importance (Mereworth Castle, Yotes Court, St Lawrence Church, Brewers Hall, the old vicarage and many original houses in their original settings with surrounding land). Its total destruction as a cohesive community would, if only a small proportion of the proposed sites are agreed, be guaranteed. TMBC has a duty surely to not only meet planning requirements but to ensure the continued existence and protect the quality of life of existing settlements.</p>	
42727777	Question 8	Numerous sites mentioned are totally unsuitable.	comments noted
42729441	Question 8	As mentioned before the existing developed Kings Hill should not be added to, it has not enough green space, it was planned and accepted as is, its facilities are overrun and do not meet current capacity requirements. The golf course should not be touched, gives employment and recreational area and sold as part of the original plan which TMBC had major input to.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42728897	Question 8	<p>Site 59827</p> <p>This site is in the centre of the village and within Shipbourne Conservation Area, Greenbelt & AONB. It contributes openness to this village of sporadic housing with some of historic value overlooking the site. Access to the site via back Lane or Upper Green Lane would be dangerous as both roads narrow. Assumed "mixed use" means private and social housing. In the latter case unlikely this is needed to any degree as attempts were made some years ago to determine the need, but interest evaporated when lack of bus services, shop and gas were realised.</p> <p>Site 59827</p> <p>This site is Greenbelt, AONB, Kent Downs and abuts the Conservation Area. The proposed development of this site (82 houses) would transform this village of mainly sporadic housing built over the centuries. Extra services would be needed let alone gas which is not available in the village. Access to Back Lane or Reeds lane is not viable as too dangerous unless major road works undertaken. The site has been used for rotation of crops on this fertile 3/3A grade land for as long as living memory. The site falls to a wide stream , gets waterlogged at intervals and prone to flooding from sewerage passing to pumping station. It is noted that minor, negligible, negative comments are regularly made in the Sustainability Appraisal .</p> <p>Site 59779</p> <p>Again Greenbelt, AONB and edge of Conservation Area. Access is very poor and dangerous unless major roadworks carried out. Drainage poor with stream to southern boundary. Back Lane very narrow and rat run with school parking and pickups giving congestion. Junction to A227 is already difficult.</p> <p>Apart from the above objections Shipbourne Village has a Village Plan of long standing and the above 3 development proposals undermine this to such a degree that a document which has helped to preserve this picturesque village will be ignored in the future if any or all the proposals are granted inclusion in the final approved plan. Finally the village has virtually no facilities, no shop, no gas, poor Wi Fi and hardly any bus service.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42489889	Question 8	<p>Site Numbers 59799/59624/59623.</p> <p>the above sites shown are all adjoining or on green belt land and conservation areas.</p> <p>in rural area on very narrow country lanes with residential properties all adjoining the proposed sites.</p> <p>all to properties get there power supplies from overhead power supplies as well as telephones and internet.</p> <p>59624 shows 185 proposed dwellings that,s possibly 370 vehicles @ 2 per property on already over crowded country lanes with out sites 59799 and 59623.</p> <p>all this is proposed on agricultural land and with the government of the day telling everyone the we must be self sufficient in growing our own produce and be able to cut costs.</p> <p>Once again this plan is looking more and more of being put together by people other than the local people of the parishes that know their local areas better than anyone.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42734305	Question 8	<p>Site reference nos: 59750, 59749, 59599, 59597, 59752, 59816, 59598, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59758, 59754, 59757, 59761.</p> <p>I have profound and well-founded objections to the proposals made for possible development sites within the village and its environs.</p> <p>The majority of the village is sited between the B2016, Seven Mile Lane and the A228, Malling Road. These roads are connected via The Street to the south (north of St. Lawrence's church) and to the north by Beech Road. All these roads have significant problems caused by traffic are not fit to cope with an increase in traffic volume.</p> <p>Any developments which increase the burden placed on these roads will seriously exacerbate congestion to a busy and dangerously narrow to the main north/south road for mid Kent. The parking problems caused in The Street, not only by Mereworth Primary School, have been ongoing for many years. The Street is regularly brought to a standstill twice a day, on one occasion in 2022 poor parking resulted in a delay of almost three hours.</p> <p>The infrastructure supporting the existing settlements in this area are woefully inadequate and over-stretched. During 2022 there were water shortages and drainage problems in Mereworth and the surrounding area. There are also semi regular power cuts, the reasons for which are unclear, but these would surely become exacerbated with further properties. Broadband coverage is also a problem with phone and internet speeds effected. This is an ongoing problem not even resolved on large residential estates in the area.</p> <p>There is a serious problem with the existing medical practice, covering Kings Hill, West Malling, Offham, West Peckham, Mereworth, Leybourne and the scattered dwellings in between. It is difficult to even get through to the GP practise by phone and virtually impossible to see a GP in person. Dentistry is no better served with no NHS dentists in the area having vacancies. The two hospitals serving the community, Maidstone and Pembury are also overstretched as is, from personal experience, the ambulance service.</p> <p>There are no secondary schools in the area which are accessible on foot requiring children to travel many miles by school bus and the very limited public transport service. In addition I believe the primary school in Mereworth is already oversubscribed and would not be able to accommodate even a fraction of children within the residential development suggested.</p> <p>Public transport from Mereworth is inadequate. Although a bus service does run to and from Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells it is, again from personal experience, infrequent and unreliable. There is no train station within walking distance, the nearest requiring a bus to get there. This is a problem for those without their own transport needing to get to places of employment and to shops, post offices etc. as Mereworth does not have such facilities.</p> <p>Sites for over 8000 dwellings are proposed for the wider Mereworth area; many of which are neither appropriate or feasible. The ingress and egress to these sites often involves single track lanes onto fast and/or congested roads which even without additional dwellings at present struggle to cope with the current levels of traffic. Breakdowns and shunts on the A228 and B2016 cause long delays and block the narrow village roads.</p> <p>It seems that only one of the sites identified appears to be on a brown field location, but even this is tenuous, the others being situated on green field and woodland. The development of these sites would greatly affect wildlife and biodiversity within the area. Several of the sites identified are also within flood zones and are presently used as agricultural land.</p> <p>Development sites under the present proposals would very effectively wipe out the village character of Mereworth, in some aspects becoming an extension of Kings Hill. The village was in the Domesday Book and has sites of significant</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>historical importance (Mereworth Castle, Yotes Court, St Lawrence Church, Brewers Hall, the old vicarage and many original houses in their original settings with surrounding land). Its total destruction as a cohesive community would, if only a small proportion of the proposed sites are agreed, be guaranteed. TMBC has a duty surely to not only meet planning requirements but to ensure the continued existence and protect the quality of life of existing settlements.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42745217	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from tidal and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42747041	Question 8	<p>Broadly agree with most of the assessments.</p> <p>Collectively, if ALL were developed, the impact on the local area would not all be positive with green space severely diminished, and the density of population putting pressure on local travel and amenities.</p>	Comments noted.
42720673	Question 8	<p>59779, 59827, 59825. Totally unsuitable for developments of any size. They would destroy farmland that has, or could, be used for food production. Local roads and junctions are already too narrow and busy, with dangerous junctions and a Primary School adjacent. Everyone would need a car as there are negligible bus services. There are no employers in the village of any size. It already takes 3 weeks to get a doctors appointment. Water is already short. Any of these developments would completely destroy this beautiful village in the Green Belt, and Kent Downs AONB.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42719329	Question 8	<p>Site 59779:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Poor drainage on southern boundary. • Access onto Back lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. • Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227. • Bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. • There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable. Site 59825: • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59825:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. • There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. • There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site. <p>Common to all three sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how “to conserve and enhance natural beauty” in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. • Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. • All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the GB. Any one of these sites would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character of this small village which has no services other than the small primary School, which is already oversubscribed. • The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26- to A227 and cross country to the A21 • The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times. • The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. • Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. • Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42752193	Question 8	<p>IDs 59735, 59798, 59804 & 59835 are areas where (on my deeds) it shows an Oil Pipe Line which has protection orders preventing the development of the land around and above.</p> <p>IDs 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804 & 59835 are green belt areas and comprise streams, woodland and farmland. It's protected for a reason and surely any loss would affect the well-being and any "green credentials" that you say is also part of your decision-making process. Services in our area are (schools, shops and medical) exist but if you were to develop around here, you would need to greatly increase capacity or build new and also develop the infrastructure to cope with those increases, once again, this would increase things such as traffic and hence pollution etc. My area, Horns Lodge Lane, is used for leisure and local agricultural use and access via the local footpaths for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders would be lost and with it, goals in your plan for supporting physical and mental well-being etc. Whilst you may think Climate Change is an issue, I am far more concerned with pollution both noise and real pollutants (not CO2) which may affect the population not only through the activities of development but any resultant increases in traffic etc. A proper benefit analysis would be needed.</p> <p>Finally, our area being semi-rural does not benefit from Gas or Mains drainage. Whilst we have overhead electricity and finally, fibre optic broadband we are still reliant on Oil fired central heating and septic tanks and klargesters and so any developments would not only have to consider these things being provided, but they would also have to be installed over long distance and in many cases, major enabling work and all that would mean to the countryside would need to be considered.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42751009	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from tidal and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tonbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801,</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain!</p> <p>The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42062017	Question 8	<p>In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550 and 59552, will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>The selection of sites 59550 and 59552, will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38488257	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>It is in particular sites 59834 and 59661,59662 and 59663 that have driven me to respond to this consultation. The idea that such a substantial amount of development whether it be residential or commercial be focussed on a narrow strip of functional flood plain that is also green belt is ridiculous. This land flood every winter, as it is supposed to as an area of flood plain. Even substantial mitigation works would just pass flood risk further down or upstream.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42758785	Question 8	<p>59673- yet more traffic on to Mill Street a narrow road, at probably it's narrowest point</p> <p>59824- again access on to a narrow rural road. Too many houses too little infrastructure to sustain.</p> <p>59450 and 59448. - A green space on a large development. Totally unacceptable to build on it !!</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42641505	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88.</p> <p>All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead) significantly.</p> <p>Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead. The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808 This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road). The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved.</p> <p>All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks!</p> <p>This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity).</p> <p>Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowded during peak times.</p> <p>A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times.</p> <p>With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban!</p> <p>As we have seen with recent developments in Hildenborough they are developed and promoted to non locals with no infrastructure changes increasing the population by default.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		With an ever increasing population through out of borough transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42687425	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, Yes No 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously allocated and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from surface and groundwater sources and many are identified as being at high increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tonbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42760065	Question 8	<p>Site 59811</p> <p>This site is predominantly agricultural and green belt, and wholly unsuitable for large scale housing development. There is no mains drainage, no public transport and no roads suitable for the number of vehicles that would be generated by a large residential development</p> <p>The only school near this site is at Plaxtol, and the narrow lanes are blocked at the beginning and end of the school day. There are only two small village shops.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42765537	Question 8	Annex 1 is not referenced on the index of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, so this is question must be excluded.	Comments noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42762977	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt. 2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages. 3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment. 4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality. in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street. Additionally no account of impact on the provision of utilities - gas, electricity water, surface water drainage and sewage - seems to have been considered. 5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area. 7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use. 8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities. 9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town. 10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25351073	Question 8	<p>The findings and assessments of each of the sites 59779, 59825 and 59827 made in Annex 1 of the SA do not accord with local knowledge. Also as indicated in answers to other questions the SA should have screened out sites in the Green Belt and the AONB as constraints at this iteration of the SA.</p> <p>Comments on the 3 sites in Shipbourne Parish:</p> <p>Common to all three sites 59779, 59825 and 59827</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26- to A227 and cross country to the A21 • The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times and provides no better service than the other two sites in terms of accessibility to the current school bus route. • All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the GB. • The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. • The pipes for providing water supply are inadequate for new development • Sewerage and land drainage are also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned below on site 59827. • Development of any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small Conservation Area status village which is in the AONB and the Green Belt and which has no services other than the small primary School, already oversubscribed. <p>Site 59779:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Poor drainage on southern boundary. • Access onto Back Lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. • Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227. • Bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. • There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable. <p>Site 59825:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identified need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. • Open site • There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. • There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site. • Dangerous access onto Back Lane or narrow Reeds Lane and dangerous junctions at either end of Back Lane. <p>Site 59830</p> <p>Despite site 59830 being included in the list, we understand that it is undeliverable and will not be part of Reg 19. If however, it were to be included, we would strongly object on the basis of our objections to the last consultation.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42771937	Question 8	<p>Site reference number 59797 and 59800 - It will result in a loss of recreational facilities for residents, will cost jobs with the loss of a golf course which is also crucial to wildlife. There is historic woodland in the area and the area is in green belt land. I understand that the development at Kings Hill was based on 40% remaining as green space and the golf course was an agreed amenity within that development. The loss of recreational space and increase in pollution will have a detrimental effect to the health of local residents.</p> <p>Site reference number 59799 - This area forms part of the green belt land and it would be an absolute travesty to turn this area into a building site. The roads cannot cope with the resulting increase in traffic, which would pass through surrounding rural settlements, impacting the residents' quality of life. Wildlife would be pushed out and people will lose vital space for walking and enjoying the countryside and pollution will increase.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42772193	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42771361	Question 8	<p>Site 59797 / Site 59800 - The golf course provides local and nearby residents with a valued and much used sporting amenity. It also provides valuable employment opportunities. The development of houses on some of the golf course land will almost certainly result in the closure of the facility.</p> <p>It will also have a negative impact on the local wildlife and reduce the number of public footpaths and bridle ways.</p> <p>Site 59799 - Watlingtonbury is classified as a “rural settlement” and is within the green belt. The existing roads and facilities struggle to cope with existing volumes and it should not, therefore, be considered for the development of further housing. Please don’t ruin our village any further!</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42773473	Question 8	<p>As previously stated sites in the Green Belt & the AONB should not have been put forward as an option for development specifically the three sites in Shipbourne - 59779, 59825 and 59827. The findings to not match local knowledge.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Back lane has dangerous junctions at both ends & is used as cut through for A road access. Access to the sites would overrun the local roads and make junctions more dangerous. 2. Local Infrastructure Water & utilities would need significant upgrades (there is no town Gas network). 3. Land drainage currently is not good on site 59827 where overflows into private properties already happen on a yearly basis as the local stream & drainage cannot cope. 4. Local Primary Schools are oversubscribed already & would not be able to accept the increased No's of children associated with the increase in family's moving into a development in the Village. 5. There is no identified need for social housing in Shipbourne, So a mixed development on this site is debatable. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42773057	Question 8	Tonbridge is already congested especially around where I live and extra traffic created by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will decrease air quality and increase risk of accidents.	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42773857	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cutthrough traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746657	Question 8	<p>Site 59641 - fulfils all five criteria of the Greenbelt, currently used for stabling and manege area which is not available anywhere else locally so would be a loss due not only to the facility they provide but the biodiversity associated with the horses.</p> <p>This is agricultural land which should be preserved as such</p> <p>This area is within 250m of a country park the wildlife of which benefits from low levels of light and noise pollution both of which would be threatened by more houses</p> <p>The area is not well served by public transport or local facilities so everyone would have to drive everywhere and the road infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic</p> <p>Sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59641, 59695, 59764,59765, 59869 - all of these will increase the traffic along Brook Street and St. Stephens area to the detriment of the children walking to local schools. There are no ways of expanding routes to these areas so congestion will be significant and to everyones detriment as well as affecting the air quality at the bottom end of the High Street</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42774913	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the Sve objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traUc along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traUc congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut- through traUc on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traUc generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traUc along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	
42776129	Question 8	Sites 59823 and 59801 are greenbelt land which must remain protected to avoid overdevelopment and destruction of the existing environment. There is no viable means of access to these sites and building at these sites will cause huge stress on local residential roads and cause major congestion on the London Rd.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
25128321	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites 59641, 59687, 59689, 59693, 59695, 59764, 59721, 59765, 59685, 59805, 59809 consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cutthrough traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	
42785025	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42785921	Question 8	<p>IDs 59735, 59798, 59804 & 59835 are areas where (on my deeds) it shows an Oil Pipe Line which has protection orders preventing the development of the land around and above. IDs 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804 & 59835 are green belt areas and comprise streams, woodland and farmland. It's protected for a reason and surely any loss would affect the well-being and any "green credentials" that you say is also part of your decision-making process. Services in our area are (schools, shops and medical) exist but if you were to develop around here, you would need to greatly increase capacity or build new and also develop the infrastructure to cope with those increases, once again, this would increase things such as traffic and hence pollution etc. My area, Horns Lodge Lane, is used for leisure and local agricultural use and access via the local footpaths for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders would be lost and with it, goals in your plan for supporting physical and mental well-being etc. Whilst you may think Climate Change is an issue, I am far more concerned with pollution both noise and real pollutants (not CO2) which may affect the population not only through the activities of development but any resultant increases in traffic etc. A proper benefit analysis would be needed. Finally, our area being semi-rural does not benefit from Gas or Mains drainage. Whilst we have overhead electricity and finally, fibre optic broadband we are still reliant on Oil fired central heating and septic tanks and klargesters and so any developments would not only have to consider these things being provided, but they would also have to be installed</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		over long distance and in many cases, major enabling work and all that would mean to the countryside would need to be considered.	
42788001	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cutthrough traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42756225	Question 8	<p>The following comments refer to the following site IDs which are within Hildenborough and surrounding areas:</p> <p>59823, 59801, 59688, 59704, 59669, 59679, 59627, 59783, 59615, 59692, 59745, 59592, 59808, 59656, 59653, 59771, 59775, 59667, 59609, 59625, 59804, 59798, and 59835.</p> <p>A significant theme in these is the reference to flooding which is significant and must not be ignored. Negative impacts on the environment are mentioned but then go onto say that how a proposed development is handled may mitigate this. However it doesn't say how, so I consider these to be very much 'jam tomorrow' statements without any real substance.</p> <p>Nearness of railway stations and buses are mentioned but it must be recognised that most will use cars to reach stations which is a negative impact on the environment and the roads infrastructure. Access to schools and medical facilities refer to sufficient capacity being available. At this time Stocks Green Primary School, with the current demographic, reports it has a waiting in double figures of children wishing to become pupils for their various classes. The ability of the school to cater for any for any population increases due to additional housing must be questioned.</p> <p>Those proposed developments shown in the Plan which are either in, or significantly link by road into Hildenborough, need to recognise the status of the B245 which appears not have been adequately considered in the plan. It is already a very busy main road, especially when the A21 Tonbridge By-pass is closed, and I doubt will be able to handle any significant increase in vehicular traffic brought about by the proposed housing developments some of which are shown to be extremely large.</p>	<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 and all forms of flooding are considered as part of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42789249	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, Yes No 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42780449	Question 8	<p>I am not in a position to support challenges technically as I sadly don't have the time, but the basic technical issues with various areas are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unless you can ask the rain to manage itself across the year, keep off flood plains unless you're going to be rebuilding wetlands. This I specifically know to be of concern in the area behind Cannon Lane and Hadlow Road and at Tonbridge Farm area - infrastructure doesn't seem to be sufficiently considered (NE Tonbridge area mentioned above and Southwest Tonbridge especially) - Development between Hildenborough and Shipbourne road seems ecologically least damaging, but again infrastructure requires significant alteration to prevent traffic bottlenecks and damage to air quality 	<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.</p>
42772225	Question 8	<p>My response focuses on sites in the Hadlow Parish (14 sites) as well as some proposed sites North of Hadlow (6) and along the eastern edges of Tonbridge (7) which would have an effect on Hadlow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) All sites in Hadlow and North of Hadlow fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt. 2) The following 17 sites in and around Hadlow consist of productive, Best Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages: 59410, 59601, 59637, 59647, 59686, 59776, 59811, 59859, 59842, 59747, 59806, 59846, 59685, 59689, 59693, 59721, 59805. These comprises two-thirds (63%) of sites offered within the Parish of Hadlow and just beyond its borders. Development on these sites will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use. Given current food insecurities agricultural land should be safeguarded against development. 3) The following 17 sites in and around Hadlow are within Flood zone 3, with a risk of flooding given as 1 in 30 years: 59410, 59601, 59637, 59638, 59647, 59776, 59811, 59859, 59842, 59747, 59806, 59846, 59685, 59689, 59693, 59805. These comprise two-thirds (63%) of sites offered within the Parish of Hadlow and just beyond its borders. They have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both mainly from surface water flooding due to more development, resulting in a huge increase in areas unable to soak up any intense or prolonged rainfall, increasing the risk of flash flooding. 4) Large development sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion along the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads as well as much increased demand on rail and bus services, as well as parking provision. 5) Sites 59806 & 59811 contain an area of ancient woodland, and should not be developed or development scaled back significantly to ensure the survival of the woodland and ability for local population to enjoy the nature around them. 6) Sites 59806, 59811, 59846, 59805 are listed as being in Water Source Protected Zone 1 areas. Given the increased likelihood of hotter summers leading to water shortages and droughts, local water sources must be protected and should be safeguarded against development. 7) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town. TMBC must ensure that habitats are created along edges of open space and alongside waterways and are maintained to allow for wildlife migration and habitat protection. 8) Infrastructure to enable active travel within and between settlements should be part of any new strategic development plan. This must go beyond the criteria of having access to bus routes, since bus services in Kent are underfunded and are under threat of either having reduced services or be cut altogether. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>9) Medical facilities in Hadlow are already oversubscribed.</p> <p>10) The number of households for Hadlow is 1,369 households (arrived at by subtracting number of households for Mereworth and Wst Peckham from total numbers given as 1,796 in the UK Census). The sites put forward for development would result in an extra 992 homes being built. This would mean Hadlow would see an increase of 172% over the next 17 years. This would totally overwhelm the existing roads, road junctions, transport, medical and educational infrastructure.</p>	
42784417	Question 8	The reports do not adequately assess each site. The full impact of the AONB is not considered and the assessment of BGGC cannot be viewed as a single site. The sites cannot be viewed in isolation the sheer scale of the developments proposed in this locality (Wrotham & Stansted) will overwhelm the community.	Comments noted.
42793889	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience:</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traUc along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut- through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42429089	Question 8	How do you expect laymen to answer these questions?	Comments noted.
38468641	Question 8	I refuse to agree to reports and appendicies that have been made so complex to understand that you either need to seek professional advice or just blindly agree with teh desired council viewpoint. I can't help feel this document is less a fair consultation but more an exercise in box ticking that will be largely ignored in the decision making process.	comment noted.
25407841	Question 8	Because I haven't navigated there yet and there is no hyper link to its location. I may come back and rewrite this answer.	comment noted.
42773793	Question 8	<p>In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street. As a local resident, the traffic along this stretch of road is already at an unacceptable level.</p> <p>Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of Tooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic Tood risk assessment.</p> <p>Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42533729	Question 8	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comment noted.
42795233	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42798785	Question 8	<p>**Site 59827</p> <p>Green belt, AONB, edge of Conservation area - development is in conflict with the CRoW Act 2000, the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement, the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan and GB policy.</p> <p>Traffic & bus considerations: Back Lane has no pavement and speeding is a huge problem as it is used as a cut-through to Hildenborough and the A21.</p> <p>No local services other than a small primary school means all children travel either by car or bus to school. KCC's Overview and Scrutiny Committee announced on 1/11/22, after consultation, its decision to withdraw subsidy for 38 contracts across the county, several of which directly impact the school buses servicing Shipbourne. Currently, there is no capacity on these buses for additional children and funding remains under pressure.</p> <p>The village is not on a gas network and sewerage is under pressure with overflows being experienced on occasion.</p> <p>Many houses are unable to access fibre optic / standard Broadband since the local provider, Gigaclear, did not provide access to all roads when it was installed in the late 2010s.</p> <p>Cost of development likely to be a challenge due to lack of gas network, reliance on off-grid domestic sewerage options and historical issues around flooding on this site.</p> <p>**Site 59825</p> <p>See considerations above relating to Greenbelt, AONB etc.</p> <p>Dangerous access onto Upper Green Road or Back Lane.</p> <p>Limited public transport options so traffic a real concern through the village and surrounding roads that are already being used as cut throughs despite poor road maintenance conditions.</p>	<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.</p>
42799649	Question 8	<p>I haven't read Annex 1 yet. If I am looking at the correct document it seems to be in excess of 1000 pages. I'm very sorry but I won't have time in the next 24 hours to read that.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42799713	Question 8	<p>Ref 59779 59827 and 59825 Shipbourne is a conservation area. If any areas were developed it would conflict with the GB policy and Kent Downs AONB. Reeds Lane and Back Lane are already a 'rat run' for the local stations and at school times. with cars racing through the lanes. Living in Reeds lane you take your life in your hands during rush hour. Public transport is limited. There is poor drainage to the Southern boundary. The area is green belt and should remain as such. The village has no gas so would put stress on the electric grid. There are issues with sewer overflow across 59827</p> <p>All three sites are totally unsuitable and this would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of a small village and a small school which already oversubscribed. Local GPs are already oversubscribed and building so many homes will put pressure on an already crumbling health service. Huge changes would need to be made to deliver on any of this and it would impact on the character and landscape of a small village. Alternative sites in a town should be considered rather than areas of local beauty.</p>	<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.</p>
38868193	Question 8	<p>The site assessments make little attempt to understand the local geography. For example, certain sites ignore impassable fences when considering distances and ignore sight lines on roads when proposing buildings. The spacial strategy is difficult to believe given the lack of effort that appears to have gone into assessing locations.</p>	<p>comment noted.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42799361	Question 8	<p>1) These sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In South West Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>Agricultural land will be lost around North East Tonbridge at the sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809</p> <p>In North West Tonbridge sites 59612, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will all remove productive agricultural land.</p> <p>8) Selecting sites 59683, will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain. The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42800449	Question 8	<p>Site 59779:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Poor drainage on southern boundary. • Access onto Back Lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. • Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227. • Bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. • There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable. <p>Site 59825:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. • There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. • There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site. <p>Common to all three sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how “to conserve and enhance natural beauty” in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. • Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. • All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the GB. Any one of these sites would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character of this small village which has no services other than the small primary School, which is already oversubscribed. • The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26- to A227 and cross country to the A21. • The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times. • The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. • Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. • Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772257	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42776289	Question 8	<p>The Sites are assessed under references 59766 (Site A), 59763 (Site B) and 59768 (Site C) and there are some parts of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments that we agree and support, whilst others we consider incorrect.</p> <p>Our comments on the relevant objectives (that we do not agree with) are set out in response to the Interim Sustainability Appraisal - Annex 1.</p>	Comment noted.
42012033	Question 8	N/a	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42800897	Question 8	<p>Site 59797 – Area affecting golf course (1228 Dwellings)</p> <p>Impact to the wildlife: course is designated by the Environment Agency as a local wildlife site as part of the nature conservation sites in their screening report for Nature and Heritage</p> <p>Area is part of Green Belt</p> <p>Original approval for Kings Hill development was based upon 40% of the area remaining green space with the golf course an agreed amenity.</p> <p>The loss of Agricultural land</p> <p>The Historic Woodland adjacent to site would be under threat</p> <p>The impact of the loss of recreation facilities for golfers, and public footpaths used by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists and joggers would adversely impact health and well-being of local residents in contradiction to SA Objective 1</p> <p>Road Infrastructure cannot support current traffic demands with bottlenecks regularly occurring daily on A228 and no easy options to address</p> <p>Medical Facilities and Schools cannot support existing demand</p> <p>Site 59800 – Area affecting golf course (275 Dwellings)</p> <p>Development on any of the golf course area would impact wildlife as Golf Course is designated by the Environment Agency as a Local Wildlife</p> <p>Site as part of the nature conservation sites in their screening report for Nature and Heritage Conservation in 2019.</p> <p>Area is part of Green Belt</p> <p>Harm to the aquifer for streams</p> <p>Development risks impacting designated Historic Woodland adjacent to site.</p> <p>Loss of recreation facilities for golfers, and public footpaths used by walkers, dog walkers, joggers and cyclists would adversely impact health and well-being of local residents in contradiction to SA Objective 1</p> <p>Road Infrastructure cannot support current traffic demands with bottlenecks regularly occurring daily on A228</p> <p>Medical Facilities and Schools cannot support existing demand.</p> <p>Approval for Kings Hill development was originally agreed upon for 40% of the area remaining green space with the golf course an agreed amenity</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42772353	Question 8	<p>The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfills all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from Tuvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42784001	Question 8	<p>The selection of sites 59515, 59516, will result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities. These spaces have been used as POS for over 50 years, maintained for a greater extent by the council. They serve as the closest public amenity space to vast section of North Tonbridge. A range of occupancies occur during the day - morning dog walkers and joggers; children playing football and frisbe after school; older children hanging out in the wood or finding a sunny place to chill relax in. The space also serves as an important wildlife corridor- with its tall hedges ad wide open spaces - allowing wildlife to thrive over the whole area and not just a very few small pockets. Developing these areas would contribute further to these areas demise and isolation of the woodland. Once such areas are lost from the urban fabric you can never get them back - which is why they should be preserved in perpetuity .</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42801825	Question 8	<p>LOCAL PLAN SITE OBJECTIONS - KINGS HILL AREA</p> <p>Due to it's rural location, I don't agree that the below sites within Kings Hill should be included in the local plan. This would see the destruction of conservation areas and green belt.</p> <p>Site 59424 Residential 164 dwellings - Woods at end of Clearheart Lane Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEFRA Forest Inventory • Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees • Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill • Harm to protected species • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Impact on Local Residents of main access • Impact on wildlife corridor <p>Site 59531 Residential 13 dwellings - Tower View [Green] (South East) Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space <p>Site 59534 Residential 18 dwellings - Tower View [Green] (North West) Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space <p>Site 59544 Residential 5 dwellings - Conservation Area off Bancroft Lane Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Harm to non-listed heritage assets, preservation order <p>Site 59547 Residential 6 dwellings - Discovery Drive next to Conservation Area Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Open Space • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas <p>Site 59630 Mixed Use TBC (est. 157) dwellings - Fields North of Amber Lane Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Green Belt • Loss of countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59631 Residential 136 dwellings - Wateringbury Road, Heath Farm fields next to Sports Centre Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Public Open Space for Kings Hill 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59634 Residential 104 dwellings - Hoath Wood Ancient Woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal Reasons for objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Ancient Woodland and TPOs (Most of site) • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59655 Residential 143 dwellings - On Road to North Pole behind Victory Drive Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Loss of countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59740 Mixed Use (Est 3,000) dwellings - Broadwater Farm Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Inadequate resources – KCC indicate suggested school location not economic, no retail centre, lack of public transport including recently cancelled bus services! <p>Site 59761 Residential 86 dwellings - Kate Reed Wood (inc. Lumber Yard) Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland (Part of site) • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>59752 Residential 1390 dwellings - South of Lapins Lane (Phase 1) to A26</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland (Part of site) • Green Belt • Loss of countryside • Access issues to local roads which are already under pressure <p>Site 59797 Residential 1228 dwellings - West quarter of Kings Hill golf course to A26</p> <p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Green Belt • Destruction of countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Access issues to local roads which are already under pressure <p>Site 59800 Residential 275 dwellings - East Quarter of Kings Hill golf course</p> <p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Loss of countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59802 Residential 644 dwellings - East of Canon Lane, South of Hollandbury Park</p> <p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Destruction of countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59884 Residential 21 dwellings - Tower View Green Area (North East)</p> <p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space and community wellbeing- was ear marked for trim trail? 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802209	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the serve objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802337	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,</p> <p>59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from tidal and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802081	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42771457	Question 8	Site 59521 Quincewood Gardens should not be considered for extra housing. This is a green site which is widely used by the local community with children playing there within easy reach of their parents - in order to reach the Woodland Walk play area, the children would need to cross the busy Shipbourne Road. There are also several mature oak trees on this site which are essential to the environment and the local community are able to gain direct access to rural walks without the need to get in cars or cross major roads.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42802433	Question 8	Site 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to the 'rare crested newts' which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil pipeline enhancements in 2018. The area is also home to deer, hedgehogs, badgers and various raptors which would all see their habitat threatened. Access is extremely poor with single lane sections. There is no pavement for most of this road which is badly lit and is already dangerous for pedestrians. A significant number of mature trees in this area including a number that have preservation orders. The local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) are already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby school and GP surgery and crowded buses at peak times. Tonbridge Road is the main thoroughfare into Tonbridge and is already v. busy at peak times and comes to a complete standstill regularly.	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.
42801729	Question 8	The findings are not clear	Comment noted.
42801569	Question 8	You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :) 1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt. 2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages. 3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from Tivial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment. 4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street. 5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut- through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area. 7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use. 8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain. The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities. 9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town. 10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42803649	Question 8	Agricultural and food production are omitted. As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, and the food insecurity experienced during lockdown, maintaining and growing our own UK production is more important than ever before. We cannot afford to lose Best, Most Valuable agricultural land to development. Environmental sustainability must imply the production of more home-grown food.	Comment noted.
42805889	Question 8	See response to Q2	Comment noted.
42806945	Question 8	Again as in my response to Question 7, my response has been covered in my earlier answers. I am totally against any development comprised in the title 'Borough Green Garden City' for reasons given in earlier responses. I apologise but I do have the appropriate site reference numbers to hand.	Comment noted.
42785409	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic Tood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cu-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42807137	Question 8	<p>59811 Protecting the countryside: There is currently a considerable amount of wildlife in and around this proposed development site. There are woodpeckers living in the trees along Oxenhoath Road, the bird life is considerable and other wildlife also use the fields. Noise and light pollution and the destruction of wildlife habitat will have a large impact on the remaining wildlife. At the south end of the proposed development is a Zone 3 flood plain, by continuing with the proposed development the large amount of concrete required would mean the land is unable to absorb any water and the run-off of water will be considerable and detrimental to the land and houses already in and around the flood zone and to Tonbridge. There is currently no mains sewage system, private draining systems are realistically unable to be monitored as to being emptied and managed correctly and would also mean a large amount of household waste water being consistently put into the River Bourne and increase the risk of flooding not only in the immediate area but the impact on Tonbridge. There is no mains gas in the area, along with no mains sewage it would require a large amount of disruption to implement, all this disruption is not protecting the countryside it is destroying it. The increased car usage required due to very limited accessibility will increase greenhouse emissions. Well-being – Due to the poor road access to the proposed development, that it is on a slope therefore difficult for those with mobility challenges and it is not near public transport or amenities are all factors that could be negative to potential residents well-being. If the site is developed there is a high probability that the proposed development will have a negative impact on their mental health of existing local residents due to the destruction of such a beautiful area and increased road traffic meaning that the lanes cannot be used to leisure, the increased light and noise pollution in an area that is currently silent dark at night along with the considerably increased high probability of flooding are all negative and</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>detriment to residents mental health. TMBC need to meet the needs of all their residents and acknowledge some residents require quiet environments for their well-being. Accessibility The main document forward states the aim to reduce traffic, if this proposed site goes ahead it will increase traffic around the lanes. The site is close to a crossroad with High House Lane and Oxenhoath Road, these lane were in the Quiet Lane scheme, both are single track lanes with no verge and very limited passing areas. These lanes are so narrow mainly without verges which inhibits people's abilities to engage in leisure activities such as walking, cycling and horse riding and requires a car to stop or find a passing place to allow both road users to continue. Common Road, which is the road of proposed access to the site, is not a 2 track road, there is no central line, cars have to use off road to pass in most of the places, there is no width for walkers, cyclists or horse riders and two cars to pass. It is approximately 1.3 miles to the A26, which is the nearest public transport, this highlights that due to poor walking and cycling accessibility due to inappropriate roads the only means to get to the A26 for all people living at the proposed site would be by car. In addition to the points discussed above in relations to addition traffic to narrow lanes and the impact of those wanting to use the lanes for leisure and no public transport this leads to forced used of cars for transport. For all potential residents who are unable or do not wish to drive cars then the development is detrimental to their accessibility if there is a disability. The proposed develop is on a slope, for people with mobility difficulties or have to use any walking aid this can mean they are restricted in walking this therefore is isolating to those who fall into this category. Although the proposed development is surrounded by countryside to access footpaths the lanes will also have to be used and most footpaths have styles along them for farmers to control their stock. A style requires a high level of mobility and stability to use therefore this would limit those who would be able to use them to the very able. Your plan promotes a range of housing in developments, I welcome diversity but I do not believe this site would meet the needs of a diverse population, it has too many limitations, housing is required for our aging population, I would suggest for any person who requires health or social care support or has a disability there are limitations regarding accessibility on this proposed site. Providing New Services: If a new transport service was to be implemented careful consideration would have to taken into account as Common Road going towards Plaxtol is very narrow at Four Wents and due to existing housing by the road would need single traffic road control. Supporting Active Travel: Due to the width of the roads – both Common Road (leading into Hamptons Park Road), High House Lane and Oxenhoath Road all being lanes some of which are single track lanes, any additional traffic will reduce the ability to use these lanes for leisure activities in particular walking, cycling and horse riding (new legislation requires passing space of 1.5 metres between a car and a horse). The proposed site of 100+ houses will be extremely detrimental for the ability to use the Quiet Lanes for leisure and the roads around the site will be for car use only due to the increased volume of traffic. Backing Local Businesses: Local business are farmers, they use the local lanes to access their fields driving large farm machinery, additional road use of cars along these lane will be detrimental to allow the farmers to access their land. There are also many businesses who provide services to farms in the area and there would be a negative impact.</p>	
42806753	Question 8	<p>No sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities (retail, schools, medical facilities).</p> <p>Expanding the town boundaries and population increase will have a negative impact on the functioning of the town centre.</p> <p>Some sites are areas in which flooding has been identified as being at huge increase risk.</p> <p>Any development that increases traffic is unacceptable.</p> <p>The extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59801, 59804 will worsen the existing traffic bottle neck between Yardley Park Road and Portman Park.</p> <p>Proposed Site 59623 will cause increased traffic and danger at the roundabout at Yardley Park Road and Shipbourne Road.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42814401	Question 8	Many sites at issue, ranging from removal of local green areas to cataloguing of sites that are not available for development e.g. 5 holes of Kings Hill golf course, areas that would be infrastructure nightmares if they were to go ahead. E.g. site 59802, privately owned agricultural land selected for c.650 houses off Cannon Lane (a single track lane with private houses either side), Wateringbury, that would have huge access issues to the lane from the blind corner of the A26, too narrow to cater for the traffic, or means of gaining without knocking down dwellings in Kings Hill and performing extensive road widening. Sites exiting onto the A228 would cause further congestion on existing infrastructure that has limited scope for improvements given the constraints of the road as it is.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42810913	Question 8	There are too many sites to comment on and I do not know the entire borough well enough. However I have concerns about the following- 59522, 59521, 59683 59516 - loss of amenity space	Comments noted.
42811201	Question 8	<p>1. Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59790, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2. Sites consist of productive, best most valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3. Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4. In South West Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephen's, Vale Road, and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cornford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6. In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7. Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8. Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain. The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9. Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10. There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11. None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42814881	Question 8	Again, very superficial and not helpful	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42814689	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42808033	Question 8	<p>1. We are residents on top of Oast Lane and will be directly impacted by the proposed sites 59821 and 59823 which fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2. Already the new development of Oakhill House, 130 Tonbridge Road, Hildenborough by Berkeley has created 165 homes (27 houses and 138 apartments). This is an extensive development very near to sites 59821 and 59823. The impact on infrastructure like B245, schools at Tonbridge and Hildenborough and GP surgery will be significant. We are absolutely against another two massive developments in the sites 59821 and 59823.</p> <p>3. The approach from Oast Lane which itself is narrow lane is not a through road and will not be able to accommodate this influx of new traffic at all.</p> <p>4. The existing sheep farm by Fairlawne Estate with its trees provides essential air quality to the neighbourhood and even to the town centre. This green space area hosts Natural Habitat & Species, which should be conserved, restored and preserved.</p> <p>5. There will be significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. Infrastructure will not cope with these new developments. Education, Health and Transport facilities will get the hardest hit and face the escalating challenge.</p> <p>6. In general with more developments in and around Tonbridge, the town and its fringes will lose the open semi rural character which is so dear to the residents.</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.
42690401	Question 8	Again - nobody is going through them all!	Comments noted.
42807937	Question 8	<p>SITE REF 59830 BOROUGH GREEN</p> <p>This site is too big. It takes up too much land. It is too close to already established housing estates. It borders an AONB and environmentally sensitive area. The infrastructure is already under pressure and whilst the ideals of what the Plan may bring the cost involved in disruption to the existing population and landscape is too high.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42820385	Question 8	See answer to Q5 above	Comments noted.
42822561	Question 8	Infrastructure details, climate change considerations and meaningful assessments as Q7 required.	Comments noted.
42820609	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial</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. All forms of flooding are considered within the Strategic Flood risk Assessment.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42822209	Question 8	A full review of all sites should be taken out prior to any being included within this consultation. Without a comprehensive review of each site, how can you expect anyone to comment on them as a whole.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42823873	Question 8	<p>A wide selection of the sites identified are on green belt land, which should be protected for the below reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 59693 – Residential • Site 59685 – Mixed Use • Site 59721 – Residential • Site 59690 – Mixed Use • Site 59805 – Mixed Use • Site 59809 – Mixed Use <p>Protected Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West European Hedgehog (<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>) • White Admiral (<i>Limenitis Camilla</i>) • Grass Snake (<i>Natrix Helvetica</i>) • Crosswort (<i>Cruciata laevipes</i>) • Additional protected species have been identified, but due to data restriction the surveys are not able to be shared with any external party, therefore a protected species survey is necessitated <p>Pen Stream</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFD water body sensitive to sediment management • WFD water body sensitive to gravel removal • Salmonid river • Increase downstream risk of flooding from land changes of farmland to housing <p>Environmental and Country Stewardship Schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land provides winter cover crops <p>Surface Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is at risk of flooding from surface water at the 1 in 30, 1 in 100, and 1 in 1000 event • Any housing development would increase this surface flood risk to the wider area including the A26 Hadlow Road East <p>Utilities and Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil pipeline operated by GPSS (Sites 59690, 59805 59809 only) • Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane are insufficient for any potential housing development • Existing primary and secondary schools are already at capacity • Only 1 existing GP surgery, which is at capacity 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flood risk are considered in the strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42825121	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where apparently there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but hundreds of houses can now be squeeze in on the flood plane! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42804705	Question 8	General development in stock greens area is likely to substantially increase existing flood risk to Brookmead estate & surrounding areas sites 227,237,402,421	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42829057	Question 8	Re: Site 59770 Mixed Use. I have the following objections: The site has no access apart from Old Lane. Old Lane is single track and is not a maintained road. It also floods regularly. There is a gate to the field at the corner of Rectory Lane and the A25. However, this was illegally installed by a past owner, Mr J Slee, to support his unsuccessful application to build houses. The field is sited opposite the Ightham Recreation Park with its large car park and children's playground. The car park caters for parents to drop off and collect children who attend Ightham Primary School. If the proposed site was approved, there would be traffic chaos around the drop off and pick up times, which would increase the risk of traffic accidents involving school children.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42831361	Question 8	59623 - This site is a significant corner in the middle of a conservation area. This house is in character for the area whereas replacement with multiple units would inherently not be under the conservation area description. It has been scored incorrectly therefore as the role it plays in the conservation area has been ignored. 59417 - It would appear this is marked as withdrawn. If that is not correct I would wish to comment. 59683 - This is the worst sort of proposal which would involve removing highly valued, well used recreational space. If lost it would be impossible to replace and cause further congestion and stress on local facilities and transport links.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38330337	Question 8	59861 - no clear infrastructure plans that would add to congestion already occurred in both areas. The plan would see a lot of natural habitat that is existing footpaths that are used regularly damaged. There is also no meeting of objective 1 It would also weaken EMR who own the land ability to research. 59856 - Poor road infrastructure with existing complaints on lorries on the last 10 years. The ability will mean the existing development would be damaged or changed. 59870 - no clear footpaths to allow access to existing infrastructure so it is not meeting objective 1. The corner is dangerous and the 16 properties would increase traffic which is not considered. There is already properties there. 59873 -no clear footpaths to allow access to existing infrastructure so it is not meeting objective 1. The corner is dangerous and the 16 properties would increase traffic which is not considered. There is already properties there. 59398 - Poor parking and objections already raised as the current road is not suitable with a clear traffic risk for joining traffics. 59397 - Existing objections to site access and the restriction of views of the downs for existing properties. 59393 - Pollution levels due to the motorway and light pollution from K Sports	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42798145	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42771841	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain!</p> <p>The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42832833	Question 8	<p>The Site has been assessed through the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (site reference: 59773) and there are some parts of the appraisal that we agree and support, whilst others we consider incorrect.</p> <p>Our comments on the relevant objectives (that we do not agree with) are set out in response to the Interim Sustainability Appraisal - Annex 1.</p>	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42801665	Question 8	<p>Site 59791 and 59792</p> <p>SA1 The medial centre isn't open yet, so the local GPs are struggling to cope.</p> <p>SA2 The roads from the developementis on to a single track road, next to a school with poor visablity.</p> <p>SA3 The primary schoo; is full , we do not have secondy school within easy wlking distance.</p> <p>SA5 Using agricultral land for developements, not enhancing the well being of the residents, food to travel further.</p> <p>Using allotments in a rural area to build houses is also against well being, health & leisure. A vital some residents being.</p> <p>There is a SSSI site not far away from the prposed site. A lot of wildlife lives in and arounde the area, foxes, badgers, newts etc.</p> <p>The developement will take away our view of the stunning countryside we choose to live in.</p> <p>SA8 The north down currantly drain in to the fields, if these are swallowed up into housing, I can see Wouldham being flooded on a regular basis.</p> <p>SA10 With no bus services, residents have to use private cars adding to congession & pollution.</p> <p>SA12 The problems caused to Wouldham with Peters village & the bridge.</p> <p>Air pollution ,through traffic , Speeding. It has made Wouldham a dangerous place to live. Adding to this will be a complete disaster.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42830913	Question 8	I do not agree that there should be any further building in the borough, particularly near Kings Hill and West/ East Malling. These areas are already overcrowded, polluted and rubbish strewn. The character of the area is being ruined.	Comment noted.
42833985	Question 8	<p>Site 59811</p> <p>Development of this site would eradicate an ANOB. There are also listed grazing sites on this plot.</p> <p>The local roads cannot accommodate this. Roughway lane would become a main thoroughfare to Sevenoaks - it struggles with minimal traffic when local road closures are put in place. Local villages would be lost in a vast conurbation.</p>	Comment noted.
42814561	Question 8	Individual sites should not build over existing community facilities in settlements. I consider that sites should not be selected that build over community facilities such as children's playgrounds, green areas within dense housing, shopping facilities regularly used in urban areas, woodlands next to urban areas enjoyed by the community etc. Where sites selected have a detrimental effect on the community by removing such facilities, equal focus and investment should given to how to enable new close at hand and accessible replacements for the impacted community.	Comment noted.
42832929	Question 8	Too many inaccuracies which I detailed in my response but the website crashed and lost my responses.	Comment noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
42834721	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the Sve objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from Tuvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42833505	Question 8	<p>Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond, but we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain.</p> <p>Development will irrevocably alter open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities- shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Comments noted.
42834145	Question 8	In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765, and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roads out along the A26 from Brook street, St Stephens, Vale Road.	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42835073	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88.</p> <p>All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No ?</p> <p>significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead.</p> <p>The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808</p> <p>This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road).</p> <p>The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency ? to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved.</p> <p>All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity).</p> <p>Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowed during peak times. A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times.</p> <p>With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban!</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		As we have seen with the recent developments in Hildenborough (Oakhill, and Hlyden Heights) they are developed and promoted to non locals increasing the population by default. With an ever increasing population through out of city transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be ? sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.	
42036865	Question 8	I think you're asking about sites in Appendix B as I can't find any Appendix D. Bourne ward has been assessed for 6000 possible dwellings in a rural, agricultural, green belt area which would be devastating for the villages, the road infrastructure, the ability to produce local food and the environment. If your ambition is to concrete over The Garden of England, this is the way to go.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42060609	Question 8	59683: Very unclear map but appears to obliterate all outdoor sports facilities from north Tonbridge which is a deprived area. I would like to see a map where I could read the street names. 59623: already refused at planning committee for reasons including a popular characterful house which is unsuitable for the overcrowding of the plot and very dangerous road safety for entrance onto Shipbourne Road and YPR	Comment noted.
42149537	Question 8	I would like to make a complaint about the proposed site ID 59494, Larkfield North ME20 6GZ. This is a main green on an estate, any development would negatively affect all the residents of the estate and will have already affected the ability of residents to sell their houses and the value of those houses. The green is maintained by the estate management company Omnicroft at the expense of residents. I would like to challenge the legality of plans for development on this basis and the legality of the identification and publication of this site in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. I would request that this site is removed from the report.	Comment noted.
42182913	Question 8	This is a substantial body of information and while many of the findings seem fair for individual sites it's clear 1) that in aggregate they don't support or provide sufficient evidence across the 14 criteria for development eg in case of one Hugh site namely no 59740 Broadwater farm. Indeed the opposite is true. There will be a loss of prime agricultural land, harm to natural environment and wildlife, concerns about impact to water sources, harm to Quiet lanes in and around the conservation area. Impact on existing rural roads and the bypass, lack of infrastructure including roads schools doctors hospitals, plus it's disastrous impact on the coalescence of East Malling West malling and Kings Hill. Then my concern no 2 is that while the sites are individually scored I can't any analysis of the cumulative impact on the rural areas of sites in aggregate namely East Malling will cease to be a rural village should one or more of the proposed sites be developed eg 59824 and 59698 both adjacent to Clare lane and 59636 at Mill Street. In addition land on site no 59636 at the side of Stickens lane. To the north sites 57756 and 59844 see to be an extension of the 140 acre site. In addition sites 59631 and 59726 at Watringbury Cumulatively a will as mentioned see coalescence of existing rural communities but equally importantly the level of all supporting infrastructure simply will not support this level of additional Concentred be new people populations.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42187617	Question 8	Site 59448 and site59450 are green amenity land for residents in the vicinity as are sites that provide parking such as Martin square, where the library needs parking	Comments noted.
25049985	Question 8	59748 The assessments do not cover accessibility - a key element for this site which would involve access through narrow residential roads used for car parking by some. 59830 It is extremely doubtful that "the green environment" could be conserved or enhanced.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42401697	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42414401	Question 8	<p>Site Ref 59534 Tower View, Kings Hill</p> <p>This was designated as protected land when houses were originally built by Liberty Property and house builders.</p> <p>It is the only landing place for the Kent Air Ambulance on the few occasions it has been required on Kings Hill - both residential and for the only shops on the hill. This is a critical service that should not become inaccessible.</p> <p>There is no other green space nearby.</p> <p>It is a very small but vital part of the community and is much valued by residents and their pets. There is no other natural environment close by to attract wildlife.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42443393	Question 8	<p>The comments below refer to the sites in north Tonbridge on the land occupied by Greentrees and Grange Farm: 59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809 I object to any development on these sites because of:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGN as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural lands (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine and our need as a country to be self sufficient in food. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land is saturated. 4) Development of these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be even worse with the proposed Tudeley and Paddock Wood development . This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development would lead to significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-desity character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on local health, educational and sewage services. 8) There will be negative impact on the town centre due to expansion ie shops, parking etc</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42470433	Question 8	<p>Site 59424: Reasons for objection: DEFRA forest inventory, ancient woodland and TPO protected trees, over development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill, harm to protected species, outside of confines of existing developments, impact on local residents of main access, impact on wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Site 59531: Reason for objection: this would change the character of the area, it would lead to more traffic to/from Kings Hill centre and through Tower view, we would lose vital public space in Phase 2 - residents walk their dogs here, children play, communities make friends.</p> <p>Site 59534: Reason for objection: this would massively change the character of the area - as you enter Kings Hill down Tower view (one of 2 main entrances) this is the first green space you come to and it's the first green space which makes it look residential rather than like just a business park, it would lead to more traffic to/from Kings Hill centre and local roads which are already overwhelmed from the new development for the over 50+ which does not have enough parking and has massively impacted Hazen Road and Woodford Grove in a negative and dangerous way - coming into Hazen is very unsafe, where would the new road to this development be? If off Tower view it would cause traffic problems and congestion at roundabout, if Hazen or Woodford it would change the nature of these areas - Woodford is a quiet close and this would change this area completely and lead to lots of traffic, we would lose valuable green space - this particular green is where people walk dogs, there are always kids and families playing sports here, in the snow people sledge here, people buy lunches at Waitrose and sit and eat here - you are taking all that away from us. Also Our house is on Woodford on this green - when we bought our house, before buying it we phoned KCC and Liberty Trust to check this green and we were assured this would never be built on and was planned and protected green space. If this is built on this would dramatically change/ ruin our house and devalue it - it would change all the light (all our windows are onto this green) and change/ reduce all our privacy. It would dramatically reduce quality of life around this area and all residents were promised the same so are likely to seek legal recompense.</p> <p>Site 59544: Objection due to this being a conservation area with a historical site (pillar box from the war), it would</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>cause significant harm to local nature and harm to non-listed heritage assets. Preservation order.</p> <p>Site 59547: Objection due to loss of green space, harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservation areas.</p> <p>Site 59630: Objection due to this being a proposed green belt and countryside area, this would harm the aquifer streams, it is outside the confines of the existing development, it would lead to traffic on existing roads and would have an awful visual impact from AONB. It is also a loss of green space - families play out here and families dog walk etc.</p> <p>Site 59631: Objection due to this being existing public open space for residents of Kings Hill, lose of countryside, harm to quiet lanes and rural road networks, it is outside the bounds of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, traffic would be impacted on local roads.</p> <p>Site 59634: Objection due to harm of conservation area, it is mostly ancient woodland, loss of countryside, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59655: Objection due to loss of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59740: Objection due to harm of conservation area, it is a proposed green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic, inadequate resources - KCC indicate suggested school location is not economic as no retail centre.</p> <p>Site 59761: Objecting due to loss of ancient woodland (part of site), loss of green belt, loss of countryside, make access to local roads difficult.</p> <p>Site 59797: Objection due to harm of conservation area, loss of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet lane and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59800: Objection due to harm of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59802: Objection due to harm of countryside and green belt area, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59884: Objection as this will change character of area, impact traffic to/from Kings Hill, loss of public open space.</p>	
42483905	Question 8	A number of the sites along the Igham bypass would lead to unattractive development, blight for existing home owners, and potentially dangerous volumes of traffic. In particular I would object to sites numbered 59770, 59709, 59720, 59872 and especially 59871	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42331649	Question 8	Commenting only in the sites in the Ightham area, the majority are green belt and should not proceed. Others are surrounded by green belt which also makes development unwelcome.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42529409	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange farm and Greentrees</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to the development on these sites for the following reasons</p> <p>1.They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF.This was the principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.,</p> <p>2.They consist of productive best most valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3a),the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages (UK imports 40% of its foodstuffs,Ukraine war has exacerbated this situation).The MAFF survey report of April 1991,carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification.</p> <p>3.They are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4.Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads.The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and P Wood,which is part of Tunbridge Wells B C local plan.This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads,including Hadlow road,Cranford Road,Barchester way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8 There will be significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9.These sites are not easily accesible to local facilities - shops,schools,medical facilities etc</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42544417	Question 8	I objecting to building of houses on Grange Farm because this is top quality agriculture land and is green belt land.	Comment noted
42544385	Question 8	I object to the building of homes on Grange Farm because it is on Green Belt land and should be protected.	Comment noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42556609	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . 59685 . 59690 . 59693 . 59721 . 59805 . 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land become saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elms Lane. Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of North Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42498753	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, Medical facilities etc</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42589313	Question 8	<p>With respect to specifically the North Tonbridge Proposed Grange Farm and Greentrees sites, the sites consist of High Grade Agricultural land which the country as a whole need for more self-sustainable food production as a result of worldwide uncertainties in food supply into the future. These areas out of the food production season suffer from seeping natural springs which manifest themselves with local flooding towards and beyond Cuckoo Lane and across to Hadlow Road. The road infrastructure and accessibility cannot sustain any more traffic, Tonbridge is a traffic nightmare as it is. Tonbridge is a small market town and will be brought to its knees, the infrastructure of schools, doctors, dentists, transport cannot cope.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42589281	Question 8	I am particularly concerned about Grange Farm and the Greentrees sites which are part of the Green Belt. This is high quality agricultural land which will be more valuable as such than as development sites. Also, this area is already very congested with traffic - any more will make life unbearable. Additionally the local schools, GP surgeries and dentists are already over-stretched.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42603521	Question 8	The housing need is not going to benefit local people. It will attract those migrating from out of London.	Comment noted.
42608993	Question 8	<p>Site 59779: This site lies within the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. It is also very close to the Shipbourne Conservation Area. It is very close to Shipbourne Primary School and the dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227.</p> <p>Site 59825: The site lies within the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB and is close to the Shipbourne Conservation Area. The site is very open and access onto Upper Green Road or Back Lane would be problematic.</p> <p>Site 59827: The site lies within the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB and is close to the Shipbourne Conservation Area. There are drainage issues associated with this site.</p> <p>Common to all sites: All three sites have Green Belt and AONB protection and are unsustainable and undeliverable unless big changes are made to current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this small village. Shipbourne is also lacking in services and amenities save for the oversubscribed primary school. Existing electricity, water and sewerage provision are already under pressure and new developments on these sites would require significant upgrades in infrastructure.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42602529	Question 8	<p>Site Ref 59779 Close to dangerous cross-roads and School. Dangerous for school children.</p> <p>Site Ref 59827 On agricultural land in greenbelt area. Access on to lane leading to Primary School which is narrow and becomes very congested at school opening and closing times. Infrastructure needed for this to be developed would be significant and costly.</p> <p>Site Ref 59825 Close to Shipbourne Conservation Area. Above comments on infrastructure and congestion also apply. Lack of public transport will add to car congestion.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42615969	Question 8	<p>Site 59779:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Poor drainage on southern boundary. • Access onto Back lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school and also a nursery which my daughter attends. <p>Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times.</p> <p>Site 59825:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. • There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. • There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site. <p>Common to all three sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how “to conserve and enhance natural beauty” in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. • Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. • All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the GB. Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary School, already oversubscribed. • The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26- to A227 and cross country to the A21 • The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times. • The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. • Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. • Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42615873	Question 8	<p>site 59811 -</p> <p>I have made specific comments below but at no point is there a reference to the flood risks of this site. The hill above the site and the site itself holds large volumes of water. Matthews Lane often has water running down it from no obvious source. This site was responsible for the Hadlow floods of 1968.</p> <p>In addition this site would have a significant negative effect on biodiversity, air quality and impact heritage sites.</p> <p>1)disagree - the majority of this huge site is not within 800m of a healthcare facility as stated. In fact the furthest point of this site is 4km from Hadlow GP. It is a similar distance to any play areas or sports facilities although there are plenty of footpaths.</p> <p>2)agree - There is no accessibility anywhere except by car. The location is remote and access is by narrow country lanes, some are used by speeding cars especially at rush hour as they race between Hadlow and Hildenborough station. There are no footpaths or street lights and even now, local residents do not walk on the lanes as it is considered too dangerous.</p> <p>3)disagree - this is a certain major negative. There are 3 primary schools all about 4km away and the nearest secondary school is a lot further. There are no bus routes and this is partly as the lanes are unsuitable for buses. There are no pavements to safely walk to the nearest bus stop which is 2 miles away.</p> <p>4)agree</p> <p>5)partly agree - the comments are correct but in addition to designated biodiversity and heritage areas , the site is home to an array of wildlife living in hedgerows, wooded areas and elsewhere that would be destroyed by the use of this site.</p> <p>14) The comment expects 100 houses could be sited here but the summary schedule says 2300. Which is it. Half the site is in West Peckham Parish, a community of about 250 residents. Even the 100 houses would dwarf the existing size of the Parish and West Peckham will lose its identity.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42583393	Question 8	<p>Site59811</p> <p>Oxenhoath</p> <p>This proposed site is in designated parkland .</p> <p>Tiny lanes surround it on all sides. Only access to main Hadlow road is along lane with no passing places . Currently you have to reverse often for 50 yards or so to let a tractor pass and this usually involves reversing off the tarmac onto rough verge. Access to Hadlow Road cannot be widened without compulsory purchase of two houses at end adjoining main road . As capacity for this site is nearly 2,500 houses where are 5,000 car going ? This proposed site would be completely gridlocked.</p> <p>There is one tiny doctors surgery in Hadlow with no room to expand. It cannot take any more patients just now and it is virtually impossible to get an appointment.</p> <p>There is only one tiny primary school with no room to expand. No secondary</p> <p>Poor bus service through Hadlow village which is already gridlocked much of the day.</p> <p>This site is not viable it is quite a ridiculous proposal.</p> <p>Currently land is used for food production either with animals grazing or with cherry apple and fruit production. It provides rural employment</p> <p>It is important in its function for grassed areas of carbon capture and with carbon capture from the wooded areas within it.</p> <p>It has incredible wildlife . A refuge for Badger , deer , foxes and birdlife including Red kites and birds of prey.</p> <p>Completely unviable to introduce 2500 homes</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42633313	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 Green belt and Kent Downs AONB. Edge of Shipbourne Conservation area. Drainage poor southern boundary. Access to Back Lane very near to Shipbourne Primary School and Children's day care and Nursery comprising two buildings. Danger to all children and will add to the congestion at drop of and pick up times. Dangerous junction with Back Lane and the 227. There is a bus stop which only provides a school service. Most buses have been removed from service. Active covenant on land restricting development. Undeliverable. Site 59825 Green belt and Kent Downs AONB. Within Shipbourne Conservation area. Very open site. Dangerous access onto Upper Green Road or Back Lane both of which are narrow country roads. Backs onto a listed building. Will adversely affect the aspect of the building and garden. Site 59827 Green belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the conservation area. Land drainage issues on the site and there's is a watercourse on the southern boundary. There are issues with sewer overflow across the site. Comments pertinent to all three sites: All sites are in Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB. If development happens on any one of the sites they would be in conflict with GB policy and with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which advises on how "to conserve and enhance natural beauty" in accordance with the Countryside And Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. Shipbourne is also a conservations area and has a Design Statement which sets out what is special and important to Shipbourne and how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. All three sites are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the GB. The development of any one of these sites would have a huge, and irreparable, impact of the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than a very small and oversubscribed primary school on a site not lending itself to school expansion. The junctions at each end of Back Lane are dangerous with speeding traffic; it is used as a cut through from the A228/A26 to the A227 and cross country to the A21. All roads other than the A227 are small country lanes which are not suitable for high levels of traffic which development of the sites would result in. The bus stops mentioned in relation to Site 59779 and 59825 are only used in the morning at school time. Most school bus services to the village have been cut. The village is not on the gas network and the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new development. Sewerage is under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on Site 59827. A sewer manhole on Back Lane has overflowed twice in recent months. Provision of water. Current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development Walkers come, in cars, on weekends and in the summer months to enjoy the AONB. The volume of cars causes parking and traffic problems. Any further development would exacerbate this problem. There are no safe options to commute to and from Shipbourne other than by car and a scant bus service. An increased volume of cars would destroy the green belt and AONB.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42637633	Question 8	<p>Site 59779: Is in the Green Belt and an AONB. and on the edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. There is poor drainage on the southern boundary. Access onto Back Lane is in close proximity to the main access to Shipbourne Primary School. A potentially extremely dangerous situation. The bus stop on the A227 provides only a school service. There is an active covenant on this land restricting development.</p> <p>Site 59825: This site is in Green Belt, in the Kent Downs AONB and within the Shipbourne Conservation area. It is a very open site with dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road or onto Back Lane. Proposal for mixed development on this site is questionable as there is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>Site 59827: This site is in Green Belt, in the Kent Downs AONB and on the edge of the Conservation Area. There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.</p> <p>COMMON TO ALL THREE SITES IN ADDITION TO ABOVE: If any of these sites were developed they would be in conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan and the Green Belt policy which gives advice on how "to conserve and enhance natural beauty" in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000.</p> <p>Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development.</p> <p>All three proposals are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Any of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary school, already oversubscribed.</p> <p>The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to and from the A228/A26 to the A227 and cross country to the A21.</p> <p>The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times.</p> <p>The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments on these sites.</p> <p>Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827</p> <p>The current systems are inadequate in the provision of water to accommodate new development.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42640129	Question 8	<p>Site Reference 59825. Any development on this site will have a detrimental affect on the setting of my heritage site/listed building and it will completely change the character. This has not been appreciated in the Sustainable Assessment. There is a direct line of sight between my heritage asset and the development site. My heritage asset is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and a Conservation Area and within Green Belt.</p> <p>Site Reference 59827, 59779, 59825. All 3 sites are designated in the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. All 3 sites are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the GB. Any development would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which is in a conservation area. It has no services other than a school which is already oversubscribed. Traffic passing through the village is already very dangerous. The village does not have the infrastructure, there is no gas so electricity would need upgrading to sustain new development. Sewage is under pressure and current water systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. Any development would mean the developer would have to make costly extra provision for these services. Site 59779 access onto Back Lane is too close to the access to Shipbourne school and could be danger to school children. Dangerous junction with A227. Site 59825 dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road or onto Back Lane. Proposed mixed development is questionable. This site is in the line of sight of a Heritage Asset and will have a detrimental affect on the setting of this property. Site 59827 already land drainage issues on this site and sewage overflow.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42642561	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764,59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock</p> <p>Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut- through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59623, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801,</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42632289	Question 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site 59779 is close to a busy crossroads, and would be a danger to schoolchildren and parents at pick-up and drop-off times. - Local village lanes are not capable of absorbing the significant amount of additional traffic which would result from any development. - No gas supply in the village - No local shops - The very good village school is already at capacity - Unsatisfactory public transport comprising only an occasional bus service. - Nearest railway stations are at Hildenborough, Tonbridge and Borough Green which are all some miles away. - All three sites are in Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB, and any development would conflict with Kent Downs Management Plan. Please also see the heading to this document which refers to "Protecting the Countryside" and safeguarding green spaces - Proposed development would ruin one of the most attractive and desirable villages in the area. The number of houses proposed could double the population of Shipbourne, completely ruin the character of the village, and could put perhaps an additional 350 cars on to the already overcrowded local lanes. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42649249	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees;</p> <p>.59685 .59690 .59693 .59721 .59805 .59809</p> <p>I object to any to any development on these sites, for the following reasons;</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A) the important of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land become saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6)Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities-shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42662273	Question 8	<p>Small, rural villages should not be suddenly swamped with hundreds of new homes. Roads that are already severely bunged up during rush hour periods will be far worse, and doctor surgeries will be pushed beyond their limits.</p> <p>It's all very well suggesting sites, but no one involved ever bothers to drive through places during rush hour to get a sense of how busy an area already is. Watlingtonbury is one such case. Traffic is a nightmare at peak times, so how can adding extra homes be of help to anyone other than those selling the land, quotas, and those selling the houses?</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42662209	Question 8	<p>ID 59623 for 2 Yardley Park Road in Tonbridge.</p> <p>I strongly object to the planning proposal to demolish [REDACTED], 2 Yardley Park Road, Tonbridge, Kent TN9 1NE and replace it with flats. [REDACTED] is in a Conservation Area which should live up to its name and preserve old buildings. [REDACTED] is over 110 years old, being built before 1911 (as proved by the Census) and it is one of the oldest houses in Yardley Park Road. This lovely Edwardian home has an attractive frontage (at the side of the house, since it originally had a circular driveway where 2a now stands) and a delightful conservatory backing onto the lawn. The side of the house faces Yardley Park Road and it was surrounded by many mature trees and a pond until 2009 when the new owners cut down many of these trees and removed the pond.</p> <p>The house inside is also delightful. The ground floor had a thick wooden parquet floor and grand wooden staircase. After entering the front door and lobby there is an unusual wooden and glass double door entrance into the large hall. The large hall has beams on the ceiling with a sweeping staircase. There is a large, elegant drawing room. The spacious dining room has French windows opening onto the lawn via the conservatory. The breakfast room leads to the kitchen, which has a connecting pantry. Another historic feature is the working push-button bell system in many rooms. The Edwardian bell-pull by the front door also still worked in 2009. Upstairs there were 3 very spacious light bedrooms (2 still having their original basins) and also a small Dressing Room (I believe that the Dressing Room has been converted into another bathroom). The top floor has 2 attic bedrooms.</p> <p>My late parents lived at [REDACTED] from 1973 until they died in 2007 and they loved this house and I know the property very well. We did not sell their home to 3 developers and instead we sold it to a family to preserve the house, who have renovated it in recent years so why knock it down now? What a waste. It would be environmentally disadvantageous to demolish a recently renovated house, wasting natural resources.</p> <p>A local historian told us that the bomb shelter should also be preserved and that few of this type still exist.</p> <p>The garden was a haven for birds, foxes and even a pine marten and it was secluded and surrounded by trees, some of which are still standing. The garden used to include a lawn tennis court that was used by top Wimbledon tennis players in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Previous neighbours at 2a and 4 Yardley Park Road both talked about it in 1973. [REDACTED] has a lovely garden that should not be destroyed.</p> <p>The extra traffic caused by so many new flats could potentially be dangerous by the roundabout, the narrow Shipbourne Road and the local shop. My father never used the Shipbourne Road entrance due to these safety issues for pedestrians and vehicles. He found the traffic congestion around their home difficult, so adding extra congestion from several cars owned by new residents of proposed flats would not be safe for them or other local residents as drivers, cyclists or pedestrians. This roundabout is already so busy at peak rush hour and school dropoff and pickup times, as well as whenever there is a delivery van beside One Stop and whenever customers park their cars outside One Stop. My father only had one car and used to find it hard enough turning out onto Yardley Park Road at peak times. Whilst my parents lived there, there were some car accidents. My father went out on a few occasions to offer help after some small car accidents, even once at 2am. Increasing the amount of cars at this corner would not be safe.</p> <p>The proposal to demolish [REDACTED] and replace it with flats received many objections from local residents when a planning application for 14 (later 13) flats was submitted to the TMBC Area 1 Planning Committee and many residents attended the meeting on 31st March 2022. The proposal was unanimously rejected by all the councillors at the meeting. Surely democracy should matter in this country and this lovely old building should not be knocked down for redevelopment.</p> <p>[REDACTED] is a delightful historic building and garden. Edwardian properties should be preserved for future generations to appreciate. [REDACTED] should not be included as a site for the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42662561	Question 8	<p>ID 59623 [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] was built before the 1911 Census. Its inclusion within an Conservation Area is due to the historic nature of the building. Demolishing one of the oldest examples removes part of the area's future appeal. The Land Registry's Title Number K634595 explains in the Schedule of restrictive covenants how the road's character was created: each plot having "one detached house or pair of semi-detached houses" (1.1) and "No building is to be erected nearer than Forty feet to Yardley Park Road and no protection therefrom to be built except one storey porches or bays not extending more than Four Feet from the main wall. All buildings shall range in line." (1.2)</p> <p>The noise and traffic disruption or [REDACTED]'s proposed demolition for the construction of new flats would impact the community significantly, particularly on two sides of a busy junction. Vehicles attached to the new flats would cause extra problems on the busy junction of Yardley Park Road and the Shipbourne Road with the latter being very narrow beside [REDACTED] and only local residents, pupils at local schools and their families understand the impact on pedestrians and vehicular access through increased traffic and delays.</p> <p>Why destroy a lovely garden? In the Covid-19 pandemic families in flats wanted to own a house and have a garden. Why can't [REDACTED] be preserved for future families to enjoy after the current family's renovations during 2009-2014? Given the government's climate change commitments, not just older trees contribute - younger trees should become mature trees. The Queen's Commonwealth Canopy and The Queen's Green Canopy weren't created for trees' destruction - why should [REDACTED]'s garden lose even more?</p> <p>Given HM King Charles III's appreciation of the Commonwealth and the appointment of our first British Indian Prime Minister, I'm surprised that Robert Lyons Sevenoaks' connection isn't a reason to save [REDACTED]. He was the Superintending Architect (earlier described as the Clerk of Works) for the iconic and famous Victoria Memorial Hall in Calcutta, India (cf "Indian Engineering" Vol 34 page 380 with details published on 12th December 1903).</p> <p>K634595 said "No stables or out-buildings to be erected on the Plots except at the extreme back limits thereof. No greenhouses or conservatories to be erected except in such a way as shall not be detrimental to the comfort or convenience of the adjoining Owners" (1.3). The current plan is very detrimental to the adjoining owners, neighbours in the local area (given the number of objections submitted to the proposal that was discussed by TMBC Area 1 Planning Committee on 31st March 2022) and pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.</p> <p>There's a contradiction between conserving an area and creating infill via urban planning. New buildings shouldn't destroy popular historic areas. Brownfield sites should have priority and infill only on appropriate sites. There is a road in Maidenhead with 1 house on each plot that is now full of new flats and this has changed the area's character. [REDACTED]'s proposed demolition shouldn't start a trend for creating new buildings that would obliterate the history of our town, country and Commonwealth.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42493185	Question 8	<p>Each individual site needs to be responded to directly with detailed point made on local knowledge and evidence. These may include some of the following :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All sites along the A26 will generate more traffic through the village and should not be considered before any sites closer to stations or Motorway junctions or in the established urban centres. 2. Particular sites requiring access along narrow country lanes or using tight junctions with limited visibility will cause unreasonably dangerous increases to traffic flows and endanger pedestrians and other road users. 3. The flood risk from flooding and run off should rule out some proposed sites, in particular to those in the flood plain of the River Bourne. I attach a copy of the flood risk maps with the proposal locations overlaid. 4. The new developments should be an integral part of the existing settlement to be sustainable. so isolated sites not connected directly to the established built up area should not be suitable. 5. If they are currently undeveloped they may be removing high grade agricultural land use and reducing the agricultural character of the area, impacting our food security. I attach a copy of the agricultural land assessment with the development sites overlaid. 6. Heritage assets, listed buildings and registered parks and monuments have protection which goes beyond the immediate curtilage to include the setting. If new development damages the setting of the listed building or park, for example by changing an isolated rural location into a housing estate, then it should be turned down. In the case of Hadlow Tower or Oxenhoath, part of the character and setting are the key long views which would be damaged by many of the proposed developments. I attach an overlay of the Historic England map of registered protected Heritage sites. 7. Hadlow is identified as a local service centre, but in truth many of these services are limited and currently over subscribed. Please can people come forward with specific facts with regards to Health and Education availability or restrictions. 8. If you feel a proposed site in another area has more potential or makes better use of underutilized land, please comment and make a case for development of these if you feel they are more suitable. 9. The ecological value of sites is also very important and some creatures have statutory protection to their habitats including Bats, Great Crested Newts, Dormice, Water voles, Turtle Doves, Badgers, & otters. If you have any sightings of any of these on particular sites it is important to raise the matter of biodiversity. 10. Trees, woodlands and hedgerows are all vital to combat global warming and need to be given greater protection in the local plan with presumptions to retain. Woodland sites should in particular not be developed. New developments need to result in a net increase in tree cover, not a loss of canopy. <p>Site Specific :-</p> <p>59638 NO - Prone to flooding/ damage to setting of a listed building and tree lined avenue (TPO ?) and question safe access.Green belt and loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>59637 NO - Extends settlement into Green Belt and tight narrow access from Cemetery Lane onto A26.Potential to flood. Next to Hadlow Cemetery with monument/history etc. Green belt / agricultural land loss.</p> <p>59686. NO - No highway access so relies on other sites to link into. ie 59637 and 59647 which together will all add congestion & pollution .</p> <p>59646. NO - Court Lane congestion plus major access problem onto A26 from Court Lane. Impact of loss of Green Belt & loss of agricultural land.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42664321	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42674753	Question 8	Disagree with the need to build on sites which have direct access to already congested main roads and areas where there are children attending schools.	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38330977	Question 8	<p>this is also included under comments on appendix B:</p> <p>HILDENBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL'S COMMENTS ON PROPOSED SITES AFFECTING HILDENBOROUGH</p> <p>Sites in isolated pockets and not considered suitable by the Parish Council as it does not meet the criteria set by the Council for development in the Parish. Sites are in the Metropolitan Green Belt which should not be impinged upon in these areas. Infrastructure would not support development on these sites: 59627, 59783, 59771, 59775, 59667</p> <p>Sites within the Green Belt which should not be developed in isolation as currently they are not adjacent to development and would require substantial infrastructure to be provided for their development. 59688, 59704, 59669, 59679, 59653</p> <p>Sites within the Green Belt which are adjacent to developed areas where significant infrastructure would be required to support it, as well as resulting in significant road congestion along the A227 which is already a black spot. Most importantly to Hildenborough development would not leave a green corridor between Hildenborough Rural Centre and Tonbridge.</p> <p>59823, 59801, 59609, 59625, 59798, 59835, 59804, (59745 could affect the corridor between Tonbridge and Hildenborough)</p> <p>Sites within the Green Belt which when placed together do adjoin the built up area but have significant infrastructure considerations as follows: 59615 and 59692 infill the area between the main rail line and the current built up area but will have implication for run off water into the Hawden Stream drainage system which is currently inadequate during periods of heavy rain. This results in flooding in the Brookmead area of foul water (last occasion 2 years ago when houses was narrowly averted from flooding with foul water). These areas are both currently within the Green Belt</p> <p>59656 – this is an important drainage area feeding into the Hawden Stream system via West Wood where steps to slow down flow have been undertaken. Further run -off will contribute to additional water feeding into the Brookmead area. Under no circumstances should the ponds and storage of run off water be removed. This area is historic parkland, but it does have access to both Stocks Green Road and Tonbridge Road and is adjacent to the current built up area.</p> <p>59808, 59592 these sites both extend the current built up area, but there is a considerable problem with drainage in this area with the B245 (Tonbridge Road) frequently subjected to a heavy flow of run off from the hillside. Drainage streams in the area are frequently not maintain exacerbating the problem.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42614881	Question 8	<p>59595- Access on extremely narrow lane with tractors, cyclists etc. which is not practical. The road could not cope with a large number of cars coming from this site where there is no space for up to 100 houses.</p> <p>59597- Access onto Mereworth Rd and Seven Mike Lane. This junction is dangerously busy at school times and more cars here would clog up the road even more as well as being a safety issue.</p> <p>59599 - far too dangerous to have a development's Access our close to Seven Mile Lane and the busy, often congested roundabout close to it.</p> <p>59811- This is an area of Outstanding Beauty with wonderful views across the Weals of Kent. To build on this would be sacrilege! The roads around it are very narrow and twisty and can not cope with more cars. No bus services run here. It is enjoyed by walkers, cyclist, horse riders and is good agricultural land. No infrastructure for schools, doctors etc.</p> <p>59750, 58816 - The Street is a very busy cut through between the A228 and Seven MiLane. It is a narrow road and is heavily congested at school times with cars parked on both sides of the road. To add over more than 100 houses would not only spoil the character of the village in its rural setting but also cause more traffic chaos. Again the infrastructure with schools, doctors etc is no pt. there.</p> <p>59758 - beautiful farm land and woodland enjoyed by horse riders, walkers etc. Also stables here and a home which potentially go. Extremely narrow road and very poor access. Would ruin a lovely part of Mereworth.</p> <p>59749, 59752, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59754,59757,59761- The roads can not cope with these developments and neither can our present surgeries, primary schools (no secondary school in the area), and other services. Mereworth and West Peckham are in danger of being overspill for the massive Kings Hill development and lose their rural and beautiful village identities.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42687073	Question 8	<p>The following sites are on the green belt and at risk of flooding: 59609/59625/59661/59683/59685/59735/59834/59612</p> <p>The following sites are also on the green belt: 59651/ 59656/59690/59693/59721/59701/59804/59805/59809/59821/59823/59835/59838</p> <p>Of the above sites the following will exacerbate traffic congestion on the A26 and other local roads: 59685/59690/59693/59721/59805/59809</p> <p>And the following will cause unacceptable extra traffic through the Shipbourne Road bottleneck between Yardley Park Road and Portman Park: 59612/59683/59804/59735</p> <p>As will development on sites 59521/59522/59746/59798/59801</p> <p>Site 59683 will also lead to significant loss of amenity space at Tonbridge Farm sportsground.</p> <p>I strongly oppose any development on the area north of Brook Street. The sites here namely 59641/59695/59764/59765/59869 are at some risk of flooding. Development on them will adversely impact on the amenity of Hayesden Country Park and on views from the High Weald AONB as well as cause a completely unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street which will overwhelm the roundabouts along the A26 into Tonbridge town centre and worsen the already very poor air quality in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>The following sites target valued amenity space: 59521/59515/59516 59550/59552/59571/59572 as does 59683 mentioned above. Of these, sites 59550/59552/59571/5972 will contribute to the already significant traffic problems along Brook Street.</p> <p>Site 59417 is currently an educational facility. A development here is likely to result in its closure. The school is not only a needed facility for local children but also a significant local employer. The undeveloped part is at risk of flooding due to its proximity to a water course.</p> <p>As mentioned elsewhere, site 59588 is located on the outer bailey of Tonbridge Castle, a stone's throw from the ancient monument, in the middle of the Conservation Area and a much needed green space in a dense housing area.</p> <p>Site 59623 is at a prominent point in a Conservation Area. A recent planning application (Planning Application: 21/01677/FL) to develop it was refused on the grounds of loss of amenity for neighbours and inappropriate development in the Conservation Area. Site access is limited and developing the access onto Shipbourne Road would exacerbate an already-existing pinch point that frequently causes tailbacks. On sustainability grounds, surely a better use for the site would be to enhance the existing structure rather than knock down a perfectly fine building.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42616097	Question 8	<p>Site 59779: Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. Poor Drainage on southern boundary. Access onto Back lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. Danger to school children and parents and congestion at pick up and drop off times. Back up of traffic on Back Lane causing congestion and hence danger on main road A227 and crossroad. Bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825: Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation area. Very open site. Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne</p> <p>Site 59827: Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.</p> <p>Common to all three sites: All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how "to conserve and enhance natural beauty" in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. Shipbourne Conservation Area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne residents and its many visitors and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in GB. Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary school, already oversubscribed. The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to and from the A228/A26- A227 and cross country to the A21. The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times. The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. New street lighting would cause light pollution to an area currently not blighted. There would be a great increase in traffic in order to access primary services not currently available in the village.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42442241	Question 8	<p>Site 59424: Reasons for objection: DEFRA forest inventory, ancient woodland and TPO protected trees, over development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill, harm to protected species, outside of confines of existing developments, impact on local residents of main access, impact on wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Site 59531: Reason for objection: this would change the character of the area, it would lead to more traffic to/from Kings Hill centre and through Tower view, we would lose vital public space in Phase 2 - residents walk their dogs here, children play, communities make friends.</p> <p>Site 59534: Reason for objection: this would massively change the character of the area - as you enter Kings Hill down Tower view (one of 2 main entrances) this is the first green space you come to and it's the first green space which makes it look residential rather than like just a business park, it would lead to more traffic to/from Kings Hill centre and local roads which are already overwhelmed from the new development for the over 50+ which does not have enough parking and has massively impacted Hazen Road and Woodford Grove in a negative and dangerous way - coming into Hazen is very unsafe, where would the new road to this development be? If off Tower view it would cause traffic problems and congestion at roundabout, if Hazen or Woodford it would change the nature of these areas - Woodford is a quiet close and this would change this area completely and lead to lots of traffic, we would lose valuable green space - this particular green is where people walk dogs, there are always kids and families playing sports here, in the snow people sledge here, people buy lunches at Waitrose and sit and eat here - you are taking all that away from us. Also Our house is on Woodford on this green - when we bought our house, before buying it we phoned KCC and Liberty Trust to check this green and we were assured this would never be built on and was planned and protected green space. If this is built on this would dramatically change/ ruin our house and devalue it - it would change all the light (all our windows are onto this green) and change/ reduce all our privacy. It would dramatically reduce quality of life around this area and all residents were promised the same so are likely to seek legal recompense.</p> <p>Site 59544: Objection due to this being a conservation area with a historical site (pillar box from the war), it would cause significant harm to local nature and harm to non-listed heritage assets. Preservation order.</p> <p>Site 59547: Objection due to loss of green space, harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservation areas.</p> <p>Site 59630: Objection due to this being a proposed green belt and countryside area, this would harm the aquifer streams, it is outside the confines of the existing development, it would lead to traffic on existing roads and would have an awful visual impact from AONB. It is also a loss of green space - families play out here and families dog walk etc.</p> <p>Site 59631: Objection due to this being existing public open space for residents of Kings Hill, lose of countryside, harm to quiet lanes and rural road networks, it is outside the bounds of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, traffic would be impacted on local roads.</p> <p>Site 59634: Objection die to harm of conservation area, it is mostly ancient woodland, loss of countryside, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59655: Objection due to loss of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59740: Objection due to harm of conservation area, it is a proposed green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic, inadequate resources - KCC indicate suggested school location is not economic as no retail centre.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59761: Objecting due to loss of ancient woodland (part of site), loss of green belt, loss of countryside, make access to local roads difficult.</p> <p>Site 59797: Objection due to harm of conservation area, loss of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet lane and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59800: Objection due to harm of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59802: Objection due to harm of countryside and green belt area, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59884: Objection as this will change character of area, impact traffic to/from Kings Hill, loss of public open space.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42690369	Question 8	<p>East Malling and the surrounding areas have a lot of character and beauty. Character and beauty that existing residents and visitors savour. Allowing any of the proposed sites to be developed for housing will significantly impact this and once an undeveloped site or green space is built on, it will be lost forever.</p> <p>I live in East Malling. In terms of infrastructure, particularly the roads, there is absolutely no capacity for any more cars and people as traffic is already problematic and essential services at breaking point. This applies to all towns and villages in the area and the south-east, not just locally. Allowing such developments will fill in the attractive and necessary green spaces between villages and towns and, in some cases, destroy increasingly crucial agricultural land.</p> <p>It is essential the proposed sites and all other open spaces remain undeveloped and I raise my objection to the proposed listings in the strongest possible sense. I object to the following sites being included in the Local Plan.:</p> <p>59448</p> <p>59449</p> <p>59450</p> <p>50630</p> <p>59631</p> <p>59636</p> <p>59673</p> <p>59698</p> <p>59715</p> <p>59726</p> <p>59740</p> <p>59743</p> <p>59824</p> <p>59391</p> <p>59393</p> <p>59397</p> <p>59398</p> <p>59469</p> <p>59460</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		59464	
		59472	
		59668	
		59694	
		59713	
		59738	
		59772	
		59780	
		59781	
		59839	
		59852	
		59856	
		59861	
		59867	
		59868	
		59870	
		59873	
		59433	
		59436	
		59437	
		59438	
		59457	
		59494	
		59718	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		59432	
		59441	
		59442	
		59443	
		59445	
		59447	
		59456	
		59488	
		59594	
		59602	
		59603	
		59619	
		59620	
		59621	
		59622	
		59645	
		59658	
		59672	
		59699	
		59714	
		59716	
		59733	
		59756	
		59762	
		59807	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		59814	
		59833	
		59844	
		59854	
		59860	
		59863	
		59634	
		59655	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42544161	Question 8	<p>59823 and 59821</p> <p>Green Belt: Both of these sites are in the green belt and fulfil the 5 objectives of green belt. They are both on the boundary between Hildenborough and Tonbridge and as such are a GREEN WEDGE. This protects Hildenborough's status as a village and stops it becoming absorbed into the urban sprawl of Tonbridge.</p> <p>Environment: These sites are the start of a large stretch of open country side stretching to Shipbourne and beyond. It has been farmed for decades and development would lead to a significant loss of agricultural land. It provides protection from flooding, includes an historic orchard and attracts a variety of wonderful wildlife. There are 2 historic ponds and many mature trees that would be destroyed forever if developed.</p> <p>Infrastructure: Outside of rush hour, the local bus service is only hourly and the nearest train stations are not within walking distance for most people.</p> <p>The local GP is already under considerable strain especially with the additional building at Fidelity and the new care home in Hildenborough.</p> <p>Both local schools Hildenborough & Stocks Green are oversubscribed.</p> <p>Our school buses are already full to the brim transporting children from Hildenborough and Tonbridge to Tunbridge Wells schools often too full to allow children on.</p> <p>Traffic: Both these sites are approximately 2 miles from the A21 (Morley's Roundabout) and they will result in a considerable amount of traffic joining the already congested B245 towards the A21 and towards the town centre. The adverse affects of pollution on health are well known and there are several schools on these already congested roads.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42714689	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42715905	Question 8	<p>I think that greenfield infill sites within developed areas, whilst they meet an objective in not pushing development to beyond the current boundaries of built up areas. They have a greater detrimental impact on the lives of locals.</p> <p>Sites 59531, 59534, 59544 & 59547 - these are open spaces within the built up area Kings Hill, that are enjoyed by locals for recreational purposes, they give character to the development and a sense of space in what would otherwise be just a mass of houses.</p> <p>The benefit from the small amount of housing that these spaces would provide is dwarfed by the level of amenity that they all ready provide to local residents.</p> <p>I would prefer development on the fringes of Kings Hill than for these treasured spaces to be infilled.</p> <p>I can only speak for my local area but I would assume that many others in other areas would feel the same about greenfield infill spaces. However I would be fully supportive of brownfield infill spaces.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42717377	Question 8	Site 59808 (to the north of Woodfield Avenue) is in the Green Belt and must not be developed. Furthermore, developing this site would have dramatic, life-changing effect on the residents of Woodfield Avenue. It is currently a place chosen by people who value tranquil, close-to-nature living. Attempts to turn it into a build site for 222 new homes will be met with strong protests, court filings, FOI-based investigations, and all other available resources.	Comments noted.
42719233	Question 8	Site 59808 Any extra housing developments around Woodfield avenue will dramatically impact to the noise and pollution level, reduce price of the current houses due to changing from "close-to-nature" and "cul-de-sac" status to properties on "through road".	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42719457	Question 8	<p>Tonbridge Road/Back Lane Ref 59779.</p> <p>1.This field has a covenant on preventing any Residential development on, thus making it non deliverable.</p> <p>2.There is a Primary School on this Road and more traffic would be dangerous to school children at drop off and pick up.</p> <p>3.The Tonbridge Road/Back Lane junction is already hazardous with busy traffic.</p> <p>4.Insufficient drainage exists on the southern boundary.</p> <p>5.This area is Green Belt and not Countryside. Given TMBC have not met 5 yr housing numbers, NPPF Policy still wouldn't be in favour of consent as there is harm to the design statement of Shipbourne also. This is an ANOB designated site.</p> <p>Conclusion: This site is unsustainable and undeliverable with current policies in place covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village. Development on this site would have huge negative impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than a small primary school, already oversubscribed. Section 106 Education contributions would not solve this. The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous, and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic as the road is used as a cut through to and from the A228/A26 to A227 and cross country to the A21. The Bus stop mentioned in relation to this site is only used at school times. The village is NOT on a gas network, so the current grid would need substantial upgrading to sustain any of the proposed developments in Shipbourne. Finally, Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. Further to this, for provisions of water, current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42719361	Question 8	<p>Site 59799:</p> <p>Green belt and AONB</p> <p>Access close to Shipbourne Primary School - danger to children</p> <p>Dangerous junction</p> <p>Site 59825:</p> <p>Green Belt and AONB</p> <p>Dangerous access to upper green road and back lane</p> <p>No identifiable need for social housing In Shipbourne</p> <p>Common issues:</p> <p>Green belt and AONB</p> <p>Conservation area</p> <p>Unsustainable and undeliverable</p> <p>No services- small primary school already oversubscribed</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42720321	Question 8	I object to thes developments	comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722017	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722145	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722305	Question 8	<p>59448 & 59450 are not suitable or available for development. These spaces have been maintained and used by the community for recreational use for over 20 years.</p> <p>59698 & 59824 are not suitable for development due to landscape constraints and the ability of the rural road network to accommodate traffic movements associated with construction and residential use.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722721	Question 8	Thy form parts of the green belt areas	comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723137	Question 8	<p>Site 59825</p> <p>In keeping with the government's emphasis on walking and cycling rather than car usage my wife and I regularly walk (and I cycle) along Upper Green Road and Back Lane.</p> <p>At most times of day, and most days, the current volume and speed of traffic along both these road, and Back Lane particularly, makes walking quite challenging, with constant need to take action to avoid vehicles, which otherwise pass dangerously close to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Vehicles include vans on most days, and heavy lorries and farm machinery on weekdays.</p> <p>When vehicles, often travelling quite fast, need to pass each other that is simply impossible if any pedestrian or cyclist is in the road, although they do sometimes try.</p> <p>This proposed site would increase the amount of traffic and provide potentially dangerous access onto Upper Green Road and Back Lane, making the use of Upper Green Road and Back Lane even less viable than now for pedestrians living in an area of outstanding natural beauty within the Shipbourne Conservation Area and seeking to enjoy that situation without undue risk.</p> <p>Additionally walking that essentially rural route would become far less attractive if the proposed development were implemented, so we would just use our cars, further increasing the traffic!</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. An active travel strategy will consider walking and cycling facilities at sites.</p>
42722945	Question 8	<p>59750 59749 59599 59597 59752 59816 59598 59759 59760 59755 59758 59754 59757 59761</p> <p>The majority of these sites is lie between the B2016, Seven Mile Lane and the A228, Mallig Road. These roads are connected via The Street to the south (north of St. Lawrence's church) and to the north by Beech Road. All of these roads have significant problems caused by traffic and in their present conditions are not fit to cope with an increase in traffic volume.</p> <p>The A228 North-South link road is extremely busy. Over 4,000 vehicles an hour pass through a 21ft wide crossroads during rush hours. Every month the daily traffic count increases. An accident or broken down vehicle already causes massive, polluting traffic congestion.</p> <p>Any developments which increase the burden placed on the A228, B2016 and the narrow lanes that interconnect these roads will seriously exacerbate congestion to a busy and dangerously narrow roads.</p> <p>The infrastructure supporting the existing settlements in this area is woefully inadequate and over-stretched. During 2022 there were water shortages and drainage problems in Mereworth and the surrounding area. There is a serious problem with the existing medical practice, covering Kings Hill, West Mallig, Offham, West Peckham, Mereworth, Leybourne and the scattered dwellings in between. Dentistry is no better served.</p> <p>There are no secondary schools in the area which are accessible on foot. They all require transport links.</p> <p>The parking problems caused in The Street, not only by Mereworth Primary School, have been ongoing for over 40 years . The Street is regularly brought to a standstill twice a day, on one occasion in 2022 poor parking resulted in a delay of almost three hours.</p> <p>Sites for over 8000 dwellings are proposed for the wider Mereworth area; many of which are neither appropriate nor feasible. The ingress and egress to these sites often involves narrow single track lanes onto fast and/or congested roads which even without additional dwellings at present struggle to cope with the current levels of traffic. Breakdowns and</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>shunts on the A228 and B2016 cause long delays and block the narrow village roads. Beech Road (very narrow, single track) and The Street are 'rat runs' between the B2016 and the A228; Beech Road is regularly used by horse and bicycle Riders as well as walkers. There are very few passing places and those which had been pushed into the fields by constant use have now been closed off, not unreasonably, by the owners or renters of the land.</p> <p>The geology in the Mereworth area is mainly clay and ragstone. This regularly results in sinkholes, some of which are both wide and deep. They begin with a pinhole and develop on investigation into large holes. Those on roads are noticeable but those on the land often go unnoticed until there are the inevitable problems..</p> <p>Development sites under the present proposals would very effectively wipe out the village character of Mereworth. This village was in the Domesday Book... Its total destruction as a cohesive community would, if only a small proportion of the proposed sites are agreed, be guaranteed. TMBC has a duty surely to not only meet planning requirements but to ensure the continued existence and protect the quality of life of existing settlements.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42726689	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation area. Poor draining on southern boundary. Access on to Back Lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary School. Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. Dangerous junction of Back Lane with A227. Bus stop on A227 currently only provides a school service. There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825 Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. Very open site. Dangerous axes onto narrow Upper Green Road or onto Back Lane Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>Site 59827 Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB & the edge of conservation area. There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site. Common to all 3 sites: All 3 sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed they would be in conflict with GB policy & conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how to conserve & enhance natural beauty in accordance with the Countryside & Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. Shipbourne Conservation area & the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. All 3 are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the GB. Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than a small primary school, already oversubscribed. The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26 - to A227 and cross country to the A21 The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827 Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42653057	Question 8	<p>Commenting only on the sites I am familiar with:- 59877 - Destroys existing public open space to the detriment of quality of life. 59881 - Significant urban sprawl to North of village, not sustainable for services. 59489 - Destroys existing public open space causing massive increase to noise, light and air pollution for residents, not to mention already major lack of parking. Waste water and utility upgrades also required. 59712 - Refer 59881 59709 - Significant urban sprawl to West of village, destroying natural grassland separation from Igham 59720 - Refer 59709 59830 - This proposal will totally destroy the entire nature of our village and surrounding areas. It would effectively create a large town with all the urban pressure on traffic, parking, services, utilities, rail services etc. etc. I can foresee no mitigation plan for these problems, just massive increases in pollution and gridlock. It would also require the redesignation of greenbelt land which is not acceptable.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42733217	Question 8	Several of the sites are not suitable for development. They are small opens spaces within existing housing areas or are existing sportsgrounds or car parks that should be retained for the use of residents.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42733441	Question 8	Site 59811 development would not promote health and wellness, the area is hugely scenic and extensively used by walkers and others. The site is bounded by three very narrow roads, non of which could support the traffic associated with up to 2000 new homes.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42739393	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 - this site is both Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB, on the edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. The drainage is poor. The access onto Back Lane is close to the primary school's main access, with a dangerous junction of the A227 and Back Lane. There is an active covenant on this site restricting development, which makes it undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825 - Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB. the site has dangerous access onto Upper Green Road or Back Lane, and there is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>Site 59827 - The site is Green Belt and AONB, and the edge of the Conservation area.</p> <p>Developing these sites would be in conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan, and the Shipbourne Design Statement.</p> <p>The primary school is small and oversubscribed, and the junctions either end of Back Lane experience speeding traffic, with no pavements for pedestrians along the narrow lanes. The bus service is limited to providing a school service for secondary pupils to Tonbridge.</p> <p>There is currently no gas provision in the village.</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.
42732097	Question 8	<p>These comments refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809. I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous plan. Any development here would encourage the joining up of Hadlow and Tonbridge. 2. They consist of productive Best Most Valuable agricultural land (grades 1,2, 3A). Recent events have highlighted the importance of domestic food production. 3. There is a known history of flooding on parts of these sites: this is likely to be exacerbated by housing development. 4. There is already peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads, causing significant cut-through traffic in Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. The proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood would exacerbate this further. 5. Development would lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6. Development would irrevocably alter the open, low density character of north Tonbridge. 7. these sites are do not have easy access to local facilities. 8. Development would add to pressure on local health and education services, which are already stretched. 	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.
42732801	Question 8	I have commented on this along side Annex 1 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report previously.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42744961	Question 8	<p>Site 59779: Is in Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. There is poor drainage on the southern boundary. Access onto Back Lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary School. There is danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. There is a dangerous junction at Back Lane with the A227. The bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825:Shipbourne Conservation Area. It is a very open site. There would be dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road or onto Back Lane. Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the Green Belt. Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary school which is already oversubscribed.</p> <p>The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous ad Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to and from the A228/A26 to the A227 and cross country to the A21.</p> <p>The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times.</p> <p>The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites.</p> <p>Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827.</p> <p>Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development.</p> <p>Site 59827: Is in the Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB and is on the edge of the Conservation Area. There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary, There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746561	Question 8	<p>Site: 59592</p> <p>We live adjacent to this land and, up until recently, took care of it as leaseholders, and wanted to update some of the appraisal findings. The main points relate to protection of the biodiversity and flood risks associated with the site.</p> <p>This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains protected species of newt. The clay like soil and run-off from land up-hill results in a lot of water running through the land and collecting in the lake. During peak periods of rain, the run-off from the lake and the land ends up on Tonbridge Road, overwhelming the drainage and contributing to the flooding of the lower lying areas like Brookmead.</p> <p>This land is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes.</p> <p>There are also many large mature trees and wooded areas that provide a habitat for the wildlife and act as a barrier for the water run-off from the fields above.</p> <p>The local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) are already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby school and GP surgery and crowded buses at peak times.</p> <p>Tonbridge Road is the main thoroughfare into Tonbridge and is already v. busy at peak times and comes to a complete standstill regularly.</p> <p>Site: 59808</p> <p>We also live adjacent to this land. Most of the points above apply to this land as well (it has a water body and lots of water run-off, as well as mature trees supporting biodiversity and the same lack of capacity in local infrastructure) but it also has public footpaths and is used by a lot of Hildenborough and Tonbridge residents for good health and well-being, particularly dog walkers, and this has increased markedly over recent years. This green area would be a considerable loss were it to be developed.</p>	<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.</p>
42746305	Question 8	<p>59595, 59597, 59598, 59599, 59747, 59749, 59750, 59752, 59754, 59755, 59757, 59758, 59759, 59760, 59761, 59816, 59846, 59811</p> <p>The villages impacted do not have the infrastructure, the schools, the doctors, dentists, the public transport, the road capacity to have additional developments. The agricultural heart of these villages would be materially impacted. The quality of air, the biodiversity, the flora and fauna which has been protected over centuries by conservation would be lost. There are NO health and well-being benefits.</p> <p>Build the houses in brown field sites, in fill in towns and cities - once you destroy Green belt land, historic villages, farming - you destroy communities. The garden of England is lost FOREVER.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746689	Question 8	<p>My comments refer to the following sites: 59685 / 59690 / 59693 / 59721 / 59805 / 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt and fulfil all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principle reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of (Grades 1, 2, 3A) Best, Most Valuable agricultural land, the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages. This classification has been confirmed by the MAFF survey report of April 1991 which was carried out by TMBC. 3) The land is very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will worsen existing traffic congestion on the A26 into Tonbridge along with other local roads. The situation will be exacerbated by the proposed development in Paddock Wood and Tudeley (part of TWBC local plan) Traffic will cut-through local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a loss of biodiversity 6) Development will put more stress on already stretched local services in Health and education. 7) Development will permanently alter the open, semi-rural. Low density character of north Tonbridge. 8) There will be a negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to expansion of the town boundaries and resulting population increase. 9) The sites are not easily accessible to local facilities...shops, schools. medical facilities etc. 	<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.</p>
42746785	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825 and 59827, all within our small, rural village of Shipbourne lie in the green belt (GB) and Kent downs AONB (KDAONB) and any development would be against GB policy and the KDAONB management plan. Site 59825 is within the Shipbourne conservation area, whilst the other two sites are at the very edge of this important area. The adopted Shipbourne design statement clearly indicates how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. The development of any of these 3 sites would have a hugely negative impact on the landscape and character of our small village with no amenities, except for the tiny primary school which my youngest children are very fortunate to attend as places are scarce. We walk to Shipbourne school every day and both back lane and Upper green road are particularly dangerous to traverse; Back lane because it is a cut through route with terrifying junctions at both ends with speeding cars and restricted visibility of both pedestrians and other vehicles and upper green road because of its narrow nature, lack of pavements and reduced visibility around bends. The proposed access to site 59779 being so close to the school entrance will provide yet another danger to our children as they arrive and leave their school. The village is poorly set up for these comparatively large developments, not only due to the few, already dangerous, roads but also due to the very little public transport (the bus routes being little more than school routes), no gas network (requiring electricity grid upgrade) and the water and sewage systems that are already at capacity. In particular, site 59827 already has sewage overflows and land drainage problems. Site 59825 would be particularly visible and would very much alter the rural feel of that central part of the village. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne and people/families placed here would have poor access to public transport and amenities. There is an active covenant on site 59779 that restricts development.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42752449	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42754145	Question 8	<p>Sites: 59779, 59825 & 59827 are all in the Green Belt and are areas of AONB, on the edge of the Shipbourne Conservation Area.</p> <p>The lanes through the Village are narrow and are subject to heavy traffic. There are no pavements. The junction of Back Lane and the A227 is dangerous and is adjacent to the small primary school, which is oversubscribed. The junction of Back Lane and Reeds Lane is also dangerous.</p> <p>The infrastructure of electricity, sewerage and water are already under pressure. There is no gas, consequently upgrading these facilities would be extremely costly.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42755137	Question 8	sites 59720,59608,59871,59793, 59709,59872,59770, 59830 not suitable as they are all in the green belt	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.
42588737	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825, 59827 all at Shipbourne</p> <p>Shipbourne is a rural area as defined by the plan. It is in the green belt and the Kent Downs AONB. The centre of the village and around Shipbourne Common is a designated conservation area.It has just over 400 households spread over a wide area with low housing density. It has no gas and no village shop, only a pub,a church.and a village primary school.. The school is a small village primary school with under 60 pupils. It has had 2 extensions in the last 25 years and no further extension is possible..The bus service is virtually non-existent except for the school bus. However it is the 'green lung' for Tonbridge. At weekends cars are parked all along Upper Green Road from the A227 as far as the village hall; two way traffic becomes impossible. The Back Lane/Hidenborough Road is an east/west rat run during rush hour and crosses the busy A227 just by Shipbourne school.</p> <p>Any building development at Shipbourne would alter the character of the village and stretch the existing infrastructure/services to breaking point. to the detriment of both the residents and the visitors who flock to Shipbourne for its beauty and the access it provides to the surrounding countryside. The adopted Shipbourne Design Statement (https://shipbourne.com/2019/07/shipbourne-design-statement/) indicates clearly how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development.</p> <p>Site 59779 The border of the proposed site on Back Lane is extremely busy at the beginning and end of the school day.I am told that there is a covenant on this land restricting development.</p> <p>Site 59825 This site , in the Green Belt and AONB abuts onto the conservation area.. Collins Cottage (listed grade 2) backs on to the north side The site has been set aside for many years which has encouraged the birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians..Upper Green Road running along its NE boundary from Wightwicks, a short terrace of whitewashed agricultural cottages, along a rising incline provides a delightful approach from the east towards the expanse of Shipbourne Common..Walkers in Back Lane enjoy the view across the rising ground of the proposed site. All this would be affected by building development, whether residential or some other mixed use purpose; (There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne).</p> <p>Sites 59827 The south side of this site is bounded by a stream which is likely to affect land drainage. Beyond the stream is Dene Park Wood. "Dene Park is a large mixed woodland with an array of pathways from which to explore the variety of deciduous trees and conifers and enjoy glimpses into the surrounding countryside" (Forestry commission website).. These 'glimpses' would be lost if site 59827 was developed.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42763841	Question 8	<p>Ref 59779 are on the Green Belt & Kent downs AONB on the edge of the Shipbourne Conversation area, There is extremely poor drainage on southern boundary, we often walk dogs in this area and its significantly boggy and does not dry up until the height of summer. Access on to Back lane would be significantly affected, during school times this road is blocked with cars from the primary school up to number 1 back lane on both sides, there are currently only 12 houses, added a proposed 35 more on one end or 80 the other would cause a complete grid lock, especially in school houses. This would not only cause congestion but a serious danger to school children. The traffic would also continue out on to the junction of back lane which is the A227 causing a high volume of cars to stop on a very busy road. There is currently a bus stop on the A227 that provides a school service and lastly there is an active covenant on this land restricting development, making it therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825 Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB is within the Shipbourne conversation area This is also a a very open site with dangerous access onto narrow upper green road & back lane. A proposed mixed development on this site is questionable, there is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne and would significantly harm current house prices and local surroundings.</p> <p>Site 59827 Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of a conservation area could be seen to cause harm to local nature and wildlife. There are land drainage issues not his site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary, There are already issues with the sewer overflow on this area adding an additional 82 houses would cause a serious problem to current and new residents.</p> <p>All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, if any of these sites were developed that would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict. Shipbourne conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne design statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of the this village. Any of these sites with the volume of houses proposed would have a huge negative impact on the rural, character and landscape of the area. Creating huge housing estates in between rural country houses would severally damage not just house prices of current residents but the rural feel of the village which is quaint and small and has currently No services other than a currently over subscribed school. The junctions at both ends of back land are dangerous and have cars regularly speeding at 3 x the speed limit, since the road is a cut through from the A228/A26 to A227 and cross country to the A21. these developments would cause a significant back log onto these roads which could result in severe accidents. The village of Shipbourne is currently not on the gas network so the electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new development. Sewerage is under pressure and overflows are already experiences Water provisions with the current systems are indadequate to accommodate a new development.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42771649	Question 8	<p>Site 59771</p> <p>This site accessing Coldharbour Lane will place further stress on a road infrastructure that is barely capable of dealing with the current usage. The road is a single track unmarked and unlit road through greenbelt countryside that can not be adapted to handle traffic flow from any of the developed sites. There is already a significant danger to pedestrian users and school children (there is no pavement), which is used daily. The site is of limited size and has previously been identified as being a habitat containing great crested newts which are legally protected. The local infrastructure is at breaking point already and can't cope with more development, esp the schools, GP surgery and busses.</p>	<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.</p>
42399681	Question 8	<p>The exercise for each site appears very poor. Accessibility, the separate nature of some sites and being Green Belt are not mentioned. Flood risk and surface water flooding is also not well investigated.</p> <p>The proximity to rail stations, schools and doctors is also poorly expressed. Having questioned the local school stated as being close to site 59692, they are a single form entrance for all years from Reception to Year 6. They currently have only 1 space and have 14 families on the waiting list for spaces. Hildenborough station has not returned to its pre covid timetable as well as the frequent closure of the ticket office and therefore its facilities thus forcing commuters to either Sevenoaks or Tonbridge.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be the key feature on these assessments especially all those sites on the B245 which is already under considerable strain and in spring will have the additional 168 units from the Oakhill development merging onto it (residents vehicles, supermarket deliveries, amazon deliveries etc).</p>	<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.</p>
42759393	Question 8	<p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809 Grange Farm and Greentrees.</p> <p>This land is in the Green Belt and of a high quality for productive farming and has been actively used as such throughout the 49 years I have lived next to it.</p> <p>What is more important than quality farm land to provide the food we need!</p> <p>This ground is well known for flooding.</p> <p>All roads into Tonbridge Town are already overloaded with traffic and not only during peak times. The local roads are also very busy and while some have traffic calming, which fails in its objective, the "Rat Runs" avoiding the main roads are dangerous due to the volume of cars using them now.</p> <p>The local doctors surgery was recently closed, moving into the centre of Tonbridge, this practice is already struggling to cope.</p> <p>The proposed developments with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council are right on the border with Tonbridge and therefore Tonbridge will become a full on nightmare with traffic issues.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42774113	Question 8	<p>Rectory Lane site - 59770 - This site is placed next to a busy stretch of the A2, particularly during school times. The potential entrances to the site would exacerbate the congestion outside the school car park. Rectory Lane itself is a small lane really designed for one way traffic. The far end of Rectory Lane is difficult to exit due to visibility. The land is also greenbelt and should be protected at all costs.</p> <p>Darkhill Farm site - 59709 and Gracelands site 59720 also have poor access in terms of existing congestion.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42776321	Question 8	<p>Rectory Lane 59770 - Mixed Use tbc Access to this site is on to small single track lanes, in green belt land and limited facilities locally to accommodate an influx of residents. Old lane in particular is impassable from about 1/2 way down. This lane is also liable to flooding due the topology of the local.</p> <p>Borough Green Garden City 59830 Massive loss of Green belt land and a hugely disproportionate site to developed in relation to the surrounding villages. Traffic is already an issue in Borough Green and Seven Oaks not just in the mornings/evening but at all times of day.</p> <p>Ightham Bypass 59872 Tiny isolated plot with no road access</p> <p>108,59793,59871,59793,59709 General loss of green space that give Ightham is rural charm. Building in these areas will remove the gap between Ightham & Borough green blurring the lines of a village and a larger settlement. There isnt the infrastructure in place, transport link or road network to adequately cope without making the area unpleasant and impractically to live in.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42776417	Question 8	<p>Site 59845 This site is in the Green Belt and comprises grade 1 Agricultural Land. For these reasons alone it is clearly unsuitable for development. It is an important open space for Watringbury village allowing views down to the River Medway. It is also the only 'break' in development between Watringbury and Teston in the neighbouring borough. The A26 is an extremely busy road with much congestion, noise and emissions at the Watringbury crossroads. A housing development on this site will exacerbate this traffic problem.</p> <p>Site 59803 This site is also in the Green Belt and comprises grade 1 Agricultural Land. It is therefore unsuitable for development. It provides a break in development between Watringbury and Teston in the neighbouring borough. The A26 and Red Hill are extremely busy roads with much congestion, noise and emissions, especially at the Watringbury crossroads. A housing development of the scale envisaged will exacerbate this traffic problem.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42795361	Question 8	<p>We understand that a natural sorting and sifting process will take place, however of the initial 291 sites put forward, 174 are on Green Belt land. These should be considered only once full appraisal has been undertaken on those 117 sites which are not on Green Belt land.</p> <p>The main threat to Hildenborough is it becoming merged with Tonbridge and Site IDs 59835, 59798, 59625, 59609, 59804, 59745 and 59823 should be considered in bulk as to develop any of these will detrimentally affect the clear demarkation of the boundry of Hildenborough.</p> <p>Site IDs 59615, 59692, 59656 and 59653 present major drainage issues which require considerable understanding on the costs to prevent the Brookmead estate flooding as all water courses feed into the Hawden Stream along both sides of the low lying Stocks Green Road.</p> <p>Site ID 59808 presents overdevelopment of that area. Whilst the Oakhill development was Brownfield site and the plans were sympathetic to maintaining the open spaces, this new site is greenfield.</p> <p>Site ID 59688 is brownfield and could be deemed suitable for settlement due to walking proximity to the station and bus stop, with the option of access points on 2 roads leading traffic away from the B245.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42776929	Question 8	<p>I object to development at the following sites. 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809. They were not included in the previous Development Plan as they fulfilled all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF, i.e. a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The MAFF survey of April 1991carried out by TMBC classified these sites as productive and Best Most Valuable Agricultural Land [Grades 1,2,3A]. Shortages caused by the Ukraine War highlights their importance.</p> <p>As well as these sites being prone to flooding to a saturation level, I am extremely worried about further congestion especially at peak times on the A26 leading to Tonbridge and other local roads. TWBC's proposed developments in Tudeley and Paddock Wood will lead to cut-through traffic on roads including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>Any development here will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity and irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low density character of North Tonbridge.</p> <p>Health and Education Services are already stretched in Tonbridge and increasing the population will seriously affect the functioning of the Town Centre in a negative way. These sites are not easily accessible to local amenities, i.e. shops, schools and medical facilities.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42715233	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 Green belt and kent downs an area of AONB in the edge of Shipbourne conservation area. Poor drainage to the southern boundary Clay based soil substructure. Access to the Back lane is in close proximity to Shipbourne Primary school, and a danger to school children . Causing congestion at drop off and pick up times. Dangeous junction at back lane with the A227 Bus stop on the A227 only supplys a school service. There is an active covenant on this land resticting developement it is therefore undeliverable. Site 59825 Green belt and kent downs an area of AONB is the edge of Shipbourne conservation area Very open site Dangerous access to Upper Green Rd or to Back lane Proposed mixed developementon this site is questionable there is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne .</p> <p>Site 59827 Green belt and kent downs an area of AONB id the edge of conservation area There are land drainage issues on this site and a water course runs along the southern boundary, There are already issues with sewer overflows across the site. Common to all three Sites All three sites are in the green belt and the kent AONB, if any of these sites were developed they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with kent downs AONB management plan which gives advice "on how to conserve and enhance natural beauty ".In accordance witht the countryside and rights of way(crow)act 2000. Shipbourne conservation area and the adopted shipbourne design statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to developement. All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to current policies covering conservationand enhancement of the AONB village in th GB. Any of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village, which has no services other than the small primary school already over subscribed.The junctions at both ends of Back lane are dangerous, Back lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through from the A228/A26-to the A227, and cross country to the A21.The bus stiop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times.The village is not on the Gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developement in these sites.Sewage is also under pressuer and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on 598277 provision of water; current systems are inadequate to accomodate new developement.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42794721	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 - AONB, opposite a primary school causing extra traffic and congestion at drop off and collection times, next to a dangerous junction along the A227 where cars already break the speed limit.</p> <p>Site 59825 - Green belt, AONB, dangerous narrow access onto back lane and Upper Green Road, open sloping site.</p> <p>Site 59827 - AONB, land drainage and sewer issues on this site. An additional 82 houses, seriously?</p> <p>Shipbourne design statement, edge of conservation area, no mains gas in the village and regular overflowing sewage.</p> <p>Bus service unreliable and lacking.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42774081	Question 8	<p>Site 59771</p> <p>This site accessing Coldharbour Lane will put even more stress on the road that is already busy. The road is a single track unmarked and unlit road that goes through greenbelt countryside and cannot be adapted to more traffic as it is. There is already an extreme danger to pedestrians especially children as the road is unpaved. The local area is already struggling with sschools, GP surgeries, busses, etc.</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.
42802369	Question 8	<p>I object to the assessments that sites 59616 and 59692 (both TN11 9AD) will have any positives. The positive assessment in relation to health and well-being completely ignores the fact that a significant part of the reason why local residents (and by extension any potential residents of developments on these sites) is as a result of the open space and clean air caused by the fact that these sites are open and on the green belt. The fact that there is a doctor's surgery nearby is irrelevant - the surgery is already struggling to cope with current demand.</p> <p>I do however agree with the assessment of flooding risk. Even without a development on these sites, Stocks Green Road regularly floods. With runoff from a development on that site the problem would be greatly exacerbated.</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.
42803297	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825 and 59827, all within our small, rural village of Shipbourne lie in the green belt (GB) and Kent downs AONB (KDAONB) and any development would be against GB policy and the KDAONB management plan. Site 59825 is within the Shipbourne conservation area, whilst the other two sites are at the very edge of this important area. The adopted Shipbourne design statement clearly indicates how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. The development of any of these 3 sites would have a hugely negative impact on the landscape and character of our small village with no amenities, except for the tiny primary school which my youngest children are very fortunate to attend as places are scarce. We walk to Shipbourne school every day and both back lane and Upper green road are particularly dangerous to traverse; Back lane because it is a cut through route with terrifying junctions at both ends with speeding cars and restricted visibility of both pedestrians and other vehicles and upper green road because of its narrow nature, lack of pavements and reduced visibility around bends. The proposed access to site 59779 being so close to the school entrance will provide yet another danger to our children as they arrive and leave their school. The village is poorly set up for these comparatively large developments, not only due to the few, already dangerous, roads but also due to the very little public transport (the bus routes being little more than school routes), no gas network (requiring electricity grid upgrade) and the water and sewage systems that are already at capacity. In particular, site 59827 already has sewage overflows and land drainage problems. Site 59825 would be particularly visible and would very much alter the rural feel of that central part of the village. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne and people/families placed here would have poor access to public transport and amenities. There is an active covenant on site 59779 that restricts development.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42717409	Question 8	<p>This section of my response is with reference to Site 59871, Site 59872, Site 59793, Site 59720, Site 59709, Site 59770 and Site 59794.</p> <p>Development of these sites would add pressure on local schools (Ightham, Borough Green and Wrotham) which are unlikely to be able to provide spaces for all children who would move into the area with the number of proposed developments. With this in mind, and considering the typical lifestyle of the families moving into these areas, they will therefore be heavily reliant on the use of cars to get their child/children to school, commute to work (or drive to Borough Green and Wrotham train station due to the continued closure of rural bus routes by KCC and the lack of accessible footpaths to the train station) and carry out daily activities such as shopping and leisure pursuits. This would exacerbate the traffic problems already seen in the areas with added pressure on already narrow, busy roads resulting in increased air pollution and unsafe roads (as many current road users drive in excess of the speed limit).</p> <p>Limited parking availability at Borough Green and Wrotham train station could also cause congestion on streets around Borough Green with the increase in cars community to the station on weekdays.</p> <p>All sites stated above would see the loss of areas of the Metropolitan Green Belt and harmful development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This would put pressure on land and wildlife with the loss of habitats and result in negatively impacting the biodiversity and geodiversity of the area.</p> <p>Development on these sites would hinder the enhancement of the borough's landscape and townscape character which make Ightham and Wrotham such attractive places to visit with the history that is associated with the villages. Whilst the proposed developments may be designed to be in keeping with the architecture of current buildings, the associated development of these properties along with the heavy reliance on cars by occupying residents would see the roads in the villages struggle to cope.</p> <p>There are limited business and working opportunities local to these sites with little opportunity to improve on these due to a) no suggestion in the Local Plan that commercial properties will be built on the sites or b) the limitations associated with development on the Green Belt. Therefore this would push new residents to use their cars to commute in and out of the area.</p>	<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.</p>
42809057	Question 8	<p>Whilst the individual site assessments are adequate. There is insufficient consideration of the cumulative landscape level effects and the adjacency problem. In particular we note that almost all of the largest sites identified > 1000 and many of the medium sites >100 fall in the area between Hadlow, Mereworth, Watlington, Kings Hill.</p> <p>These sites alone account for about 12,000 houses but all of them are in the green belt. I am very concerned that they will therefore be seen to offer a quick and easy option to reach the target of 16,000.</p> <p>Traffic congestion in this area, exacerbated by the limited bus services along the axis Maidstone, Watlington, Hadlow, Tonbridge, will lead to a significant deterioration in usability of the road network.</p> <p>I therefore believe that the call for sites exercise is not fit for purpose and that the call for sites should only be focused on areas selected for development in the strategic plan option selected.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25386113	Question 8	<p>The main issue with regards to Hildenborough Village is the retention of its separate identity apart from Tonbridge. The main threat to Hildenborough is represented by Site ID's 59835, 59798, 59625, 59609, 59804, 59745 and 59823. A development on this scale would effectively join North Tonbridge to Hildenborough having a detrimental effect upon the Village.</p> <p>Within Hilden Park, the existing development of Oak Hill House, a Brownfield site is considered to be a reasonable alternative use of the office accommodation; however, Site ID 59808 represents an over-development of that area and has serious implications with regards to access to the B245 which is already compromised by excess traffic flow.</p> <p>Site ID's 59615, 59692, 59656 and 59653 represent major issues regarding drainage owing to the topography of the local area which drains towards Stocks Green Road and hence uses the Hawden stream through the Gough Cooper Estate. This area is vulnerable to flooding despite the protection offered by the Leigh Flood Barrier; consequently development of these areas would aggravate the situation.</p> <p>Alternative sites without such drainage issues are available on other Brownfield sites along Stocks Green Road, e.g. 59688 and also adjacent site 59704.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42775841	Question 8	<p>I have reviewed the Local Plan as it affects Shipbourne namely site IDs 59779, 59827 and 59825. I do support the issues raised by the Parish Council and I will comment and/or endorse them individually below.</p> <p>I would however, first make a more general point about the effect that any one of the proposals would have if they proceeded. Shipbourne is a small village in and surrounded by the green belt and areas of natural beauty. On most weekend days the village green is teeming with people who walk with children and pets, cycle, picnic and generally enjoy open air ambience of one of the very few villages that have the natural vista and area to accommodate such a wide range of activities.</p> <p>The infrastructure has evolved to support the open structure and tiny population of the village and would require significant investment to usefully accommodate the additional housing detailed in the .</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the village houses have to rely on septic systems as a mains sewage connection inaccessible. • There is no mains gas available. Home heating is usually tanker delivered gas or oil. • The primary school is tiny and already oversubscribed. There is little room for physical expansion. It sits immediately beside a main, straight road that has never had a speed limit respected by the majority of drivers. • The water supply comes from a very small reservoir and although the supply has never ceased altogether there have been instances of very low water pressure. <p>Building out even the smallest of the items (59779) would overburden the existing infrastructure but would not justify the expenditure required bring it up to modern day standards.</p> <p>In other words it would destroy one of the most picturesque villages in Kent and transform it into a rather mediocre small town.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38531361	Question 8	<p>59811</p> <p>objectives as listed:</p> <p>1] No healthcare facility of sports facility within 800m. Nearest medical centre closest to nearest point of development is 4km away in Hadlow</p> <p>2] Agree, very poor accessibility</p> <p>3] The closest primary schools are both approx 4km away. Significantly further for secondary schools with very limited transport infrastructure</p> <p>4] No economic benefits locally. The local environment is very rural in character</p> <p>5] Once this designated greenbelt land is lost to development it is lost forever. This land is important for food production, biodiversity and no housing however planned can enhance the landscape that has no infrastructure to sustain such development. The greensand ridge is an important geological feature of the country and this development would carve straight through it.</p> <p>6] Clearly its very negative if developed as it would obliterate a large tranche of green belt and conservation area.</p> <p>7] The site is close to may heritage buildings designated so because of their historical and cultural importance within the local area.</p> <p>8] Its an area full of springs coupled with a risk of flooding which without the soil to run off into will present massive flood risk. Visit the area when it rains heavily.</p> <p>9] Farmland/agricultural land, the garden of England, once lost will be lost forever.</p> <p>10] The site is a long way from a railway station [nearest Tonbridge, parking stretched already] non existent bus services and no cycle routes. No street lights or pavements on local roads</p> <p>12] Disagree, the area is not suitable for any large scale development due to a total lack of any infrastructure, facilities or utilities. It will destroy what is a local amenity for food production, walking, wildlife and biodiversity. Extending existing urban sites or adjoining them where an infrastructure is in place should be implemented</p>	<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.</p>
42824705	Question 8	<p>For the all sites in the East Peckham (TN12) area which lie within the floodplain (flood zones 2, 3 and 3b) it is essential to note and properly assess the risks that any development would exacerbate the flooding in downstream communities within the Medway Valley.</p> <p>This applies to the following sites: 59613, 59837, 59876, 59616, 59782, 59650, 59855, 59742, 59682, 59789, 59646</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flood risk are considered in the strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42832577	Question 8	<p>SITE 59811</p> <p>1. Current Policy as stated by the PM Rishi Sunak does not support building in the Green Belt but should make use of other existing space,</p> <p>2. This site extends significantly outside the developed area of the village of Hadlow across great swathes of PURE green belt far from the RSA which as previously indicated is rather deceptive on the plan,</p> <p>3. The site will merge Parishes of Hadlow and the smaller village of West Peckham without any division .</p> <p>4. The site has no existing suitable infrastructure therefore all its creation will be damaging for the environment. No suitable access roads or direct access to any major roads . Will cause dangerous overloading of small country lanes No paving or other pedestrian infrastructure. The economics will also be less viable than that of alternative more urban development ,</p> <p>5. The area suffers from significant water flash flooding ,as water from the higher hills drains down together with the geological makeup of the ground conditions . This is evident by the continual streams of water than can flow in Oxenhoath road and also across the fields to Common Road .</p> <p>6. Future Water Management Issues. Given that the ground already cannot absorb all the water in wetter months if extensive hard surfacing is added over much of the land this will become a significant problem to manage.</p> <p>7. The site encroaches into the Heritage and Cultural Parkland area of Oxenhoath with its magnificent Grade 11* Manor house , walled gardens and 140 acres, ensteeped in history . The development will have significant negative impact on the a much larger area of the heritage English rural landscape.</p> <p>8. The rolling landscape of rural farmland , established hedgerows, significant oaks (TPO's present) and other native trees , Fauna and flora . A special habitat for biodiversity that a wide variety of Wildlife is home to , many birds of prey (Sparrow Hawks , Owls) and host of other bird life. Mammals from small weasels ,Bats , Stoats Hairs, Badgers , Foxes . The lake has its own diversity of waterlife from amphibians (including variety of newts), snakes , fish and variety of insect life , the whole system being a balanced ecosystem that will be irreparably damaged.</p> <p>9. The area is actively farmed with very fertile arable and pasture land with established dairy herd and variety of rotated crops .It's size is economic for farming activity as opposed to some other areas. (I state this as a son of a farming family) and Destruction of this resource will not only remove more agricultural land but damage the aformentioned ecosystem. It will also remove local food production.</p> <p>10. The area is crossed by footpaths and used extensively by hikers and walkers allowing them to easily access the health benefits in body and mind in such a picturesque tranquil environment.</p> <p>For all the above reasons development in Option 4 is unsuitable and damaging given the alternatives.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42716769	Question 8	<p>2.0 Wateringbury site considerations and objections.</p> <p>I do not believe Wateringbury is well placed to offer sites. The village does not have the required infrastructure to function as a Rural Centre (nor become a defacto urban area by being merged with Kings Hill) to support an increased population. It suffers already from serious traffic congestion and has a most limited retail and service offering. Many of the sites proposed for consideration would destroy areas of outstanding and accessible countryside of Grade 1 and 2 farmlands, with landscapes of great character. In addition, there are a range of difficult access issues and concerns around fresh water supply and the water table in certain areas of the village.</p> <p>2.1) General Objections applying to all sites around Wateringbury</p> <p>(i) Water. During the summer drought of 2022 there were occasions in Canon Lane (and perhaps more widely in the village), when South- East Water was unable to provide a fresh water supply. TMBC will need to be satisfied that, with climate change, the village is supported with adequate fresh water supplies and infrastructure to meet its existing needs, let alone the demands of new housing.</p> <p>(ii) Environment. The proposals in this area will adversely impact the area's CO2 levels from both the new build on greenfield sites and increased traffic flows. The area around the Wateringbury crossroads is already the most polluted part of the Borough.</p> <p>The character of this landscape, its wildlife, and the access it provides to the natural environment, should be preserved.</p> <p>In looking at the possible sites around Wateringbury, TMBC needs to protect its legacy by minimising greenfield development and look instead elsewhere to other sites already supported with adequate infrastructure where residents are not significantly dependent on their cars to meet their daily needs</p> <p>2.3) Canon Lane</p> <p>Canon Lane is an historical, and in most parts, single track lane rising approximately 60 metres to the north where it terminates in a cul-de-sac against narrow woodland and the housing boundaries of Kings Hill. It is bounded in its lower half by extensive traditional stone walls on either side of the narrow lane which date back several hundred years. Its junction with the Tonbridge Road provides limited visibility and has, we understand, seen fatalities.</p> <p>The lane is popular with walkers and cyclists from Kings Hill and the surrounding area, meeting footpaths to both the East and the West at its higher level and providing at the northern end pedestrian access to Kings Hill.</p> <p>2.4) Site 59800 additional objections</p> <p>(i) Access. Canon Lane is not capable of providing safe access to any further housing developments along its length. As noted above, it is single lane in the most part, heavily frequented by walkers and cyclists, including unaccompanied school children, and has a dangerous exit on to the Tonbridge Road.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how access to this proposed site can be achieved without obtaining additional rights of way from Kings Hill by demolishing houses on that estate to establish a roadway. Canon Lane itself is entirely unsuitable for higher volumes of traffic.</p> <p>(ii) Water table. During the summer of 2022 the small lake shown on the site plan drained, caused, we understand, by a sinkhole which had opened up. This has affected the water table flowing down parts of the hill side leaving empty a further large pond downstream in the water infrastructure which had existed for over a hundred years or more. Subject</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>to expert advice, any further housing developments on the higher reaches of the lane (either this site or site 59802 to the east) could have further effects on the natural flows of water with potential adverse consequences.</p> <p>2.5). Site 59802 objections</p> <p>(i) Amenity values and landscape of character. Site 59802 comprises well managed vineyards and, until recently, productive agricultural fields which have been set aside for reasons which are unclear.</p> <p>To the north it bounds and provides footpath access to Cattering Woods which we understand are a protected area. To the south it has exceptional views across miles of beautiful countryside, woodlands and hills providing a landscape of great character. These views would also be significantly damaged by development of the possible sites in the area of Pizien Well on the opposite side of the valley.</p> <p>The footpaths that cross the proposed site provide attractive walking routes to the north, east and south and are heavily frequented particularly by residents of Kings Hill. If these footpaths are eliminated with new build, the recreational walking areas available to these residents in this local area will be constrained largely to a single narrow footpath around the perimeter of the golf course to the west. The farmland comprising this site provides an important amenity for the encouragement of mental well-being and exercise, and access to the natural environment with its wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>With climate change, the well managed recent development of vineyards on this site has provided an attractive alternative use of the farmland bringing sustainable employment opportunities. Vineyards provide an important agricultural evolution for the region with a growing economic contribution to the County, including local tourism, and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The loss of such an outstanding site to the community, to the local character of this part of the Kentish countryside, and the growing evolution of its agricultural contribution and example, would have significant impact.</p> <p>This land should be protected as one of the treasures of the area .</p> <p>Canon Lane does not offer a safe or appropriate access. In addition it is not clear how access from the east can be secured without cutting through Cattering Woods which are protected.</p>	
42833313	Question 8	<p>59797 development of this site would result in the closure of the golf course with a negative affect on the health of many people especially elderly golfers who would otherwise get no exercise. Without that exercise the health of the elderly would suffer causing medical issues with further strain on the NHS. It would also remove an area which is home to much wildlife, with a detrimental affect on the environment</p> <p>59596 This is green belt land and should not be developed</p>	Comments noted.
42834081	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825, 59827: All three sites are within GB and AONB. All are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to current GB and AONB policies. Development of any of these sites would have huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services, other than the small primary school which is already oversubscribed. Junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a rat run through to the A228/A26 and cross country to the A21 and Hildenborough Station. No gas in village, sewerage system would need redevelopment, water supply would need upgrading. No jobs in village (except at pub and school).</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42140193	Question 8	<p>My reasons for objection</p> <p>Site: 59884 - Tower View - Green area (North East) Residential 21 dwellings - This development surrounds Tower View, Maypole Drive, Kendall Avenue.</p> <p>Reasons for objections - change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre, loss of public open space and loss of tree canopy.</p> <p>Site: 59531 - Tower View - Green area (South East) Residential 13 dwellings - This development surrounds Tower View, Melrose Avenue, Braeburn Way, Alfriston Grove, Bovarde Avenue.</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Reasons for objections - change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre, loss of public open space and loss of tree canopy.</p> <p>Site: 59534 - Tower View - Green area (North West) Residential 18 dwellings - This development surrounds Tower View, Woodford Grove, Cardinal Walk. Baxter Way, Hazen Road, Kendall Avenue.</p> <p>Reasons for objections - Reasons for objections - change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre, loss of public open space and loss of tree canopy.</p> <p>Site 59424 Residential 164 dwellings Woods at end of Clearheart Lane</p> <p>Reasons for objections: DEFRA Forest Inventory; Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees; Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill; Harm to protected species; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Impact on Local Residents of main access; Impact on wildlife corridor</p> <p>Site 59544 Residential 5 dwellings Conservation Area off Bancroft Lane</p> <p>Reasons for objections: Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas; Harm to non-listed heritage assets, preservation order</p> <p>Site 59547 Residential 6 dwellings Discovery Drive next to Conservation Area</p> <p>Reasons for objections: Loss of Green Open Space; Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas</p> <p>Site 59631 Residential 136 dwellings Wateringbury Road, Heath Farm fields next to Sports Centre</p> <p>Reasons for objections: Existing Public Open Space for Kings Hill; Countryside; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads</p> <p>Site 59634 Residential 104 dwellings Hoath Wood Ancient Woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal</p> <p>Reasons for objections; Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas; Ancient Woodland and TPOs (Most of site); Countryside; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads; Visual Impact from AONB</p> <p>Site 59740 Mixed Use (Est 3,000) dwellings Broadwater Farm</p> <p>Reasons for objections: Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas; Proposed Green Belt; Countryside; Harm to the aquifer for streams; Harm to non-listed heritage assets; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads; Inadequate resources – KCC indicate suggested school location not economic, no retail centre</p> <p>59752 Residential 1390 dwellings South of Lapins Lane (Phase 1) to A26</p> <p>Reasons for objections: Ancient Woodland (Part of site); Green Belt; Countryside; Access issues to local roads</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59797 Residential 1228 dwellings West quarter of Kings Hill golf course to A26 Reasons for objections: Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas; Green Belt; Countryside; Harm to the aquifer for streams; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads</p> <p>Site 59800 Residential 275 dwellings East Quarter of Kings Hill golf course Reasons for objections: Green Belt; Countryside; Harm to the aquifer for streams; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads</p>	
42834625	Question 8	Shipbourne is a small village and the developments 59779,59827,59825 are completely disproportionate and would overwhelm it. They are all on Green Belt land in an AONB. There are no facilities in the village and the small school is already full. The roads are narrow and under strain at collection time at the school and nursery and at weekends when many come to enjoy walking in the area. There are few buses and fewer jobs.	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.
42557441	Question 8	I cannot answer this question, there is too much material to assess and it has not been well organised. It would have been easier to have some form of numerical score, so sites could be ranked and sites should be organised by area, with a key map showing where the areas are located in the borough.	Comments noted.
42718689	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbelt AONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42606017	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42021761	Question 8	As I am not familiar with many of these sites I cannot comment	Comment noted
42393985	Question 8	Unable to determine from the data provided	comment noted
25310017	Question 8	<p>CPRE Kent welcomes the amendment made to table 9 of the local plan consultation document that links the SA reports, site references and site plans. However, it is noted that Appendix D of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report relates to site assessment criteria and not to individual site assessments suggested by this question.</p> <p>Has this question been incorrectly drafted, when it should in fact refer to Table 1.6 (residential site options) in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report: Non-technical summary, and crossed referenced to Annex 1 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (site plans)?</p>	Comment noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
42441153	Question 8	have you any idea how tricky it is to navigate this?	Comment noted.
25361537	Question 8	The Kent Downs AONB Unit would be happy to provide high level informal comments on the potential impacts of sites within the AONB and its setting that are being considered for allocation, once an initial sift has taken place by the Council.	Comment noted.
42614849	Question 8	I am not well informed enough to make a judgement	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42640897	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59793, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in green belt and/or AONB and would cause damage/ loss of this land	Comment noted.
42654465	Question 8	<p>SITE 59861</p> <p>This site, while seeming very attractive at first glance providing as it does the potential to meet nearly 10% of the OAN, will be untenable locally. The only two exits would be either onto Hermitage Lane and/or onto Kiln Barn Road. Hermitage Lane is already congested in busy periods and the addition of an additional 2000 cars on top of those already using it and those to be built under applications already approved will make the road a major traffic hot spot for most of the day. This road is also the road that leads to Maidstone Hospital and will result in further delays to A&E admissions and missed appointments. Kiln Barn Road exits onto the A20 at Ditton Corner and already suffers congestion at busy times and this will be made worse when the Orchard Mill development is built out. Kiln Barn Road also leads to Watlington Road via Easterfields and Sweets Lane - both single track lanes will have limited passing spaces.</p>	Comment noted.
42698177	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in green belt and/or AONB and would cause significant harm to the green belt and AONB	Comment noted.
42394785	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and/or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbelt AONB	Comment noted.
42443745	Question 8	no comment	Comment noted.
42716321	Question 8	I disagree with the sites that fall under options 3, 4 and 5 above.	Comment noted.
42719777	Question 8	<p>Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and/or AONB and would cause harm to the existing local environment.</p> <p>All these sites would significantly reduce access to quality education, healthcare and similar facilities which are already under stress.</p> <p>All would impact on Air Quality which is already an area of great concern in and around Borough Green.</p> <p>Flooding is already experienced within Ightham and surrounding areas. All these sites would have a significant and detrimental effect on water management.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42720545	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and/or AONB and would cause harm to the existing local environment. All these sites would significantly reduce access to quality education, healthcare and similar facilities which are already under stress. All would impact on Air Quality which is already an area of great concern in and around Borough Green. Flooding is already experienced within Ightham and surrounding areas. All these sites would have a significant and detrimental effect on water management.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722625	Question 8	? doesn't make sense	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722849	Question 8	<p>59608</p> <p>This is a very inaccessible place - it will go down a road that can only fit one car wide to reach it from Back Lane and the amount of traffic generated by 37 homes, especially causing air pollution to arise while cars wait to let each other past to reach the drive way into the plot around the rows of cottages on either side of the drive way. If access is the other side of the house there - cars will be going back and forth right up to the garden of cottage there - with 37houses - that is at least 37 cars if not more going back and forth - increasing air pollution levels.</p> <p>This plot is an area of outstanding natural beauty and opposite a nature reserve which preserves a very delicate ecosystem for a native plant -as a nursery it is already very environmentally friendly and offers biodiversity and greenery amongst the flowers and plants it grows - inside and outside greenhouses and the open beds. It is difficult to see how housing would improve the soil - given the site is a nursery.</p> <p>It is very much a going concern - I am not sure why an existing good business would be turned over to residential housing. and it would presumably disrupt the other business down that drive way. It seems that it would be difficult to argue that it improved sustainability for the economy by changing it to residential.</p> <p>There is only a very limited bus service at the end of the road that mostly works during school times and is likely to be closed down - school children in this area essentially need cars to get to the school bus stops - where there is a bus or to get to school. The buses have been reduced and cancelled - so people living here have to have cars - and the access here is not able to cope with that many cars. It is not near a school or medical facility.</p> <p>We are near Ightham Mote and further cars can cause problems with access to that house given the narrow single track lanes around here.</p> <p>Overall it seems that this would bring a lot of congestion to the area especially giving limited accessibility of the site , as well as destroy open space next to AONB without the benefits of improving economic situation and helping people get houses in places where they can easily get to work, school and medical facilities.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42681825	Question 8	<p>I'm not saying 'Yes' or 'No' to particular sites but supplying details that should be taken into consideration. Important factors re all Hadlow sites. As far as I'm aware, the primary school is only taking new pupils if they have siblings there; the Dentist is not taking any more NHS patients & the Doctors list is full.</p> <p>59601 Originally safeguarded because of its amenity value for the setting of the village & the Grade 1* Listed Hadlow Tower. Has a high water table & is in the flood plain of the river Bourne. The owner has enhanced its biodiversity by planting trees & he doesn't want to build on the land.</p> <p>59605 One part of a much bigger field lying along the A26 recently taken over by travellers. Entire field has been wild grazed by horses. Bordered on the west side by a series of ponds connected to streams & ponds to the north. Lonewood Way, the last houses at this end of the village, regularly floods in heavy rain. Any further development can only result in more flooding. There have been quite a few accidents at the junction adjacent to the site.</p> <p>59635 A planning application is already under consideration & has been objected to, principally on the grounds of inadequate road access/congestion, inadequate health & schooling facilities & inappropriate design features. A traffic count in 2019 showed a figure of 2007 motor vehicle movements (count site number: 810327).</p> <p>59637 Previously used for fruit growing. Land abuts narrow Cemetery Lane to the north. Bell-mouth onto the A26 is tight & cannot currently be improved as there are houses on the south side & a private garden to the north. Underground stream runs diagonally across the land which manifests itself during prolonged rain & floods the footpath from Cemetery Lane. Stream is part of the system which runs from Gover Hill, across the A26, thence to Caxton Place ponds (off Court Lane), into the Bourne & eventually the Medway. Land is Grade 2. Rural in aspect. Good views to Hadlow Tower.</p> <p>59638 Meadow, regularly used for grazing sheep. Provides part of the setting of James House (17thC, Grade 2 listed), a view which includes converted oasts seen down an avenue of mature trees. Pond fronting the site & adjacent to A26 is fed from a pond on the west side of the road & a stream from the north. Water flows down to the river Bourne in a culvert under the A26. In 1968 Hadlow village was flooded due to the pond & culvert being overwhelmed by water flowing off Gover Hill. The only vehicular access is the drive serving James House & the oasts. Track would have to be widened, threatening the avenue of mature trees & would be immediately adjacent to the listed house.</p> <p>59686 Field to the rear of James House forms part of the setting of the listed building. Some waterlogging. Previously used for fruit growing & sheep & horse grazing. The only vehicular access is the drive serving James House & the oasts. Track would have to be widened, threatening the avenue of mature trees & would be immediately adjacent to the listed house. Grade 2 land</p> <p>59647 Land has been used for fruit growing & grazing. The site abuts Court Lane. Court Lane is a rat run during rush hour carrying traffic to & from East Peckham & Tonbridge via Golden Green. Traffic count in 2019 showed a figure of 2007 motor vehicle movements (count site number: 810327). Single lane width between the access to site 59635 & the A26 due to on-street parking. Not suitable for carrying yet more traffic from another new development, especially if site 59635 goes ahead. Grade 2 land.</p> <p>59776 Land is subject to some flooding. Currently used as rough grazing for horses. Access would be off narrow & winding Carpenters Lane, which is not suitable for substantially more development. Alternative access through The Paddock or the car park at the Village Hall would be intolerable for current residents. Currently no footway along Carpenters Lane after Hope Farm. The road is a rat run in rush hour.</p> <p>59795 Currently only sporadic development of single houses & bungalows, sited in large gardens, along this part of Ashes Lane. A small estate of houses would be out of keeping with this rural part of the parish which is some distance from local amenities. There is no footway in Ashes Lane & no immediate public footpath access across the fields to the village. It has a pleasant open rural aspect with tall mature trees across 2/3rds of the site. Currently used for grazing</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>sheep.</p> <p>59811 Mainly grassland grazing for sheep & cattle. Some crop growing adjacent to Oxenhoath Road & Common Road. Hops & fruit in the northern section at Gover Hill. Any development would be intrusive in the rural landscape. Open views of village & Hadlow Tower. Protected parkland? The whole area was the ancient impaled parkland belonging to Oxenhoath. In 1968 water flowing from Gover Hill & Oxenhoath caused flooding in Hadlow. No footway access to Hadlow. No public transport.</p> <p>59842 Used for grazing sheep. Part of old parkland belonging to a large house. There were originally some fine old trees on the land. It has a high water table which feeds into the Bourne & Medway rivers. Has been the subject of several failed planning applications. It would be pushing the village boundary further into the Greenbelt which is not acceptable.</p> <p>59853/59857 Currently greenhouses & teaching facilities for Hadlow College & orchard. No indication of what would go into the mixed development. It would mean more traffic feeding into narrow & inadequate country roads – Court Lane & Victoria Road - as already outlined. People recreationally walk down Victoria Road which has no footway. It would be pushing the village boundary further into the Greenbelt which is not acceptable.</p> <p>59859 The land is in the floodplain of the Bourne & really floods (photo evidence). Used for ploughing practise by Hadlow College students. Community allotment on the land. What mixed use? Houses? Work? College activity? Backland over-development. More concrete means higher flood risk.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42744641	Question 8	<p>SITE IDS: 59813, 59639, 59640, 59753 and 59782</p> <p>All the above sites are unsuitable for development due to i) very poor accessibility; ii) sites in flood zones 2 and 3; iii) roads to the sites flood; iv) sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding; v) high ground water means the use of soak aways is unlikely to be suitable/sustainable for this area; vi) sites on greenbelt land; vii) surface water discharge from 59813 in particular could flood property downstream; viii) building on site 59813 contradicts anti-coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham; ix) CLH fuel pipeline goes through 59813; x) no railway station close by; xi) closest railway station is not a mainline station, has no parking and has no direct routes to London; xii) closest railway station has no lighting or pavement on the roads leading to it and the roads flood; xiii) there is no GP surgery in the village (the NHS refused to continue funding it so it closed down) Yalding or Paddock Wood are the closest GP surgeries.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of these sites are on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. For food security reasons - we must not build on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. Once it is lost, it is lost. - there is an animal sanctuary nearby; - there is an ancient pilgrimage trail passing through; - Bush Road is narrow, unlit and with no pavements - light pollution will ensue from development destroying the natural darkness; <p>The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a Rural Service Centre to a Rural Settlement.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. All forms of flooding will be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42765665	Question 8	Not sure	Comment noted.
42768321	Question 8	I am against all plans for change!	Comment noted.
42781825	Question 8	I disagree with site reference 59688. The area is prone on flooding.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38330689	Question 8	<p>Site 59610 Residential: Park Road Addington – The Parish Council would have no objection to the development of this site.</p> <p>Site 59628 Residential: Millhouse Lane Addington – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site as we feel it would represent overdevelopment.</p> <p>Site 59725 Residential: Ford Lane – The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site. Although we would be concerned about the loss of this site as a leisure facility and the tourism it brings to the area we feel it would be a good site for affordable homes given its proximity to the road network and bus service.</p> <p>Site 59730 Residential: Addington Lane Trottiscliffe – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We have concerns about more vehicles accessing the road which regularly floods in this area.</p> <p>Site 59736 Mixed Use: Addington Lane, Trottiscliffe – comments as above. Site 59850 Mixed Use: East of Addington Village – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We feel that any further development would destroy the openness of this area Site 59812 Mixed Use: A20 Clearways Addington – The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site and feel it could work as a mixed-use site. Site 59830 Mixed Use: Borough Green Garden City, Borough Green, Wrotham & Platt – The Parish Council is concerned about the fact that Borough Green will lose its identity and be swamped by this development. We are concerned about the effect on the infrastructure and the impact this will have on our village. The proposal would undoubtedly result in an unwelcome increase in traffic and pollution in Trottiscliffe which is already used as a rat-run. We recognise that this site could provide some housing but feel it should be on a smaller scale.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42788801	Question 8	All sites need to meet wildlife and habitat conservation as a primary consideration rather than secondary alongside human activities.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42795041	Question 8	Haven't had opportunity to read this (working parent) but I hope this does not exclude my opinions from being heard.	Comment noted.
42794529	Question 8	I don't understand it	Comment noted.
25386625	Question 8	<p>In response to this question Berkeley has focused on the assessment of its site at Broadwater Farm (site ID: 59740).</p> <p>Berkeley does not agree with the findings for Broadwater Farm (site ID:59740). The findings in the Interim SA are by definition high level and preliminary in nature. In contrast, Berkeley has carried out a detailed, site-specific Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in support of its live planning application (LPA Ref. 21/02719/OAEA). The conclusions of that assessment were as follows:</p> <p>"An EIA has been undertaken for the proposed development in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. As a result, we have been able to demonstrate that with appropriate mitigation designed into the proposals (during the construction and operational stages of the proposed development), almost all of the potentially adverse effects identified can be appropriately mitigated for or reduced to a level which is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>A significant beneficial socio-economic impact is anticipated to arise from the proposed development due to providing for identified housing need, labour supply, increase expenditure and improved healthcare and education provision. As demonstrated by the technical work undertaken there are no significant technical constraints that would preclude the development or harm deliverability. It has been demonstrated that whilst the development would give rise to some adverse impacts, mitigation measures have been proposed to minimise them."</p> <p>The detailed assessment work that sits behind these conclusions is a much better and more thorough indicator of Broadwater Farm's suitability for a strategic level of housing-led development and has led to agreement between Berkeley and the Council, in the context of the planning application, that development at Broadwater farm is sustainable, suitable for development, available and deliverable.</p> <p>Broadwater Farm (site ID: 59740)</p> <p>The site is located to the north of Kings Hill in Tonbridge & Malling Borough and extends to approximately 118.5 hectares. The site is in the sole control of Berkeley. This control by a single developer is particularly important in terms of demonstrating the deliverability of development on the site within the plan period.</p> <p>In summary, and based on the submitted application plans and supporting documents, development at Broadwater Farm can deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing: Berkeley expects to be able to deliver 900 homes within the new Local Plan period, and these will be high-quality bespoke designed homes including 30% affordable housing. • Sustainability: a range of measures that will assist in mitigating climate change; both in the layout of the development and the construction of dwellings. Working with existing water flows to create a new waterscape that works in harmony with the landscaping and creates new habitats. • Community: community infrastructure including a GP surgery, primary school, and secondary school. The secondary school in particular would serve the wider area (Kings Hill currently has no secondary school). • Green Infrastructure: a broad and diverse range of green infrastructure including parkland, woodland, small village greens and squares, children's play spaces, and sports pitches. • Heritage: a scheme that has been conceived on the basis of a detailed understanding of the constraints of the site, 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>including the particular significance of the identified heritage assets within the site and surrounding area, including the contribution that is made by setting (including the site).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity: a significant net gain in biodiversity comprising a mix of new and improved habitats. • Highways: Local road improvements, including new and improved pedestrian, cycle, and equestrian links to existing public rights of way providing access to the countryside. • Economy: new employment opportunities, training, and investment in the local economy. 	
42834049	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbelt AONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42632289	Question 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site 59779 is close to a busy crossroads, and would be a danger to schoolchildren and parents at pick-up and drop-off times. - Local village lanes are not capable of absorbing the significant amount of additional traffic which would result from any development. - No gas supply in the village - No local shops - The very good village school is already at capacity - Unsatisfactory public transport comprising only an occasional bus service. - Nearest railway stations are at Hildenborough, Tonbridge and Borough Green which are all some miles away. - All three sites are in Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB, and any development would conflict with Kent Downs Management Plan. Please also see the heading to this document which refers to "Protecting the Countryside" and safeguarding green spaces - Proposed development would ruin one of the most attractive and desirable villages in the area. The number of houses proposed could double the population of Shipbourne, completely ruin the character of the village, and could put perhaps an additional 350 cars on to the already overcrowded local lanes. 	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25400737	Question 8	<p>"59708 Questions posed are not relevant to small developments (this is for three houses) and therefore the assessment is not helpful. In principle a small development may work in this area however there are significant access issues (private land) and safety concerns due to close proximity to a successful preschool and well utilized footpath."</p> <p>"59840 The Parish Council does not agree that the whole of this site qualifies as brownfield land. The eastern part of the site has derelict buildings and structures, and we agree that this is brownfield and appropriate development might be considered here. Although parts of the remainder of the site were subject to landfill, this has to a certain extent now blended into the landscape and the previous use of the site should not be used to justify extensive built development over the whole site. Development of this site would also be highly visible within the AONB.</p> <p>"59691 Agree with assessment, not a sustainable site"</p> <p>"59863 Agree with assessment, not a sustainable site"</p> <p>"59864 and 59866 Part of this site is in the parish of Birling however this is not acknowledged in the consultation. The site is adjacent to an area of Special Scientific Interest, highly visible from AONB and is Grade 2 farmland."</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42798785	Question 8	<p>**Site 59827</p> <p>Green belt, AONB, edge of Conservation area - development is in conflict with the CRoW Act 2000, the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement, the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan and GB policy.</p> <p>Traffic & bus considerations: Back Lane has no pavement and speeding is a huge problem as it is used as a cut-through to Hildenborough and the A21.</p> <p>No local services other than a small primary school means all children travel either by car or bus to school. KCC's Overview and Scrutiny Committee announced on 1/11/22, after consultation, its decision to withdraw subsidy for 38 contracts across the county, several of which directly impact the school buses servicing Shipbourne. Currently, there is no capacity on these buses for additional children and funding remains under pressure.</p> <p>The village is not on a gas network and sewerage is under pressure with overflows being experienced on occasion.</p> <p>Many houses are unable to access fibre optic / standard Broadband since the local provider, Gigaclear, did not provide access to all roads when it was installed in the late 2010s.</p> <p>Cost of development likely to be a challenge due to lack of gas network, reliance on off-grid domestic sewerage options and historical issues around flooding on this site.</p> <p>**Site 59825</p> <p>See considerations above relating to Greenbelt, AONB etc.</p> <p>Dangerous access onto Upper Green Road or Back Lane.</p> <p>Limited public transport options so traffic a real concern through the village and surrounding roads that are already being used as cut throughs despite poor road maintenance conditions.</p>	<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.</p>
45644993	Question 8	: No. These are factually correct but are trying to justify housing development without concomitant improvements in the infrastucture	Comments noted.
42722625	Question 8	? doesn't make sense	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
45357665	Question 8	<p>[59779, 59827, 59825]</p> <p>Contrary to metropolitan Green Belt policy which advocates the "open-ness" if the countryside, rat-run traffic on narrow country lanes.</p>	Comments noted.
43485921	Question 8	[SITE REF: 59740] - Due to the volume of work associated with answering this question appropriately from a BAG perspective, work is ongoing in this area, however it is likely that BAG will be making a case for Site 59740 Broadwater Farm in its current form to be excluded from going forward in the Local Plan.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42544353	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42652417	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, , 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the SVE objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously allocated and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42762977	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt. 2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages. 3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment. 4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality. in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street. Additionally no account of impact on the provision of utilities - gas, electricity water, surface water drainage and sewage - seems to have been considered. 5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area. 7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use. 8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities. 9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town. 10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42814689	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25128321	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites 59641, 59687, 59689, 59693, 59695, 59764, 59721, 59765, 59685, 59805, 59809 consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cutthrough traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42795233	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722529	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously allocated and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from tidal and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42785025	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42825121	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where apparently there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but hundreds of houses can now be squeeze in on the flood plane! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42785409	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic Toot risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42773857	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cutthrough traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42642561	Question 8	<p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59623, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42799361	Question 8	<p>1) These sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In South West Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>Agricultural land will be lost around North East Tonbridge at the sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809</p> <p>In North West Tonbridge sites 59612, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will all remove productive agricultural land.</p> <p>8) Selecting sites 59683, will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain. The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42711009	Question 8	<p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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.</p>
42080737	Question 8	<p>1,410 are being promoted for possible development between the rural communities of Burham and Wouldham.</p> <p>Given that Peters Village has recently been built between the two, and another huge development planned for Eccles (with the traffic exiting via Burham), it would take this one document to be put forward to obliterated all the rural communities in this area in one planning move.</p> <p>Some of these developments are suggested on the best and most versatile farming land, and others in flood areas highlighted in the same doc. Most are also in view of the AONB.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42811201	Question 8	<p>1. Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59790, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2. Sites consist of productive, best most valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3. Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4. In South West Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephen's, Vale Road, and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cornford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6. In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7. Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8. Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain. The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9. Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10. There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11. None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42808033	Question 8	<p>1. We are residents on top of (redacted) and will be directly impacted by the proposed sites 59821 and 59823 which fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2. Already the new development of Oakhill House, 130 Tonbridge Road, Hildenborough by Berkeley has created 165 homes (27 houses and 138 apartments). This is an extensive development very near to sites 59821 and 59823. The impact on infrastructure like B245, schools at Tonbridge and Hildenborough and GP surgery will be significant. We are absolutely against another two massive developments in the sites 59821 and 59823.</p> <p>3. The approach from Oast Lane which itself is narrow lane is not a through road and will not be able to accommodate this influx of new traffic at all.</p> <p>4. The existing sheep farm by Fairlawne Estate with its trees provides essential air quality to the neighbourhood and even to the town centre. This green space area hosts Natural Habitat & Species, which should be conserved, restored and preserved.</p> <p>5. There will be significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. Infrastructure will not cope with these new developments. Education, Health and Transport facilities will get the hardest hit and face the escalating challenge.</p> <p>6. In general with more developments in and around Tonbridge, the town and its fringes will lose the open semi rural character which is so dear to the residents.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42716769	Question 8	<p>2.0 Watringbury site considerations and objections.</p> <p>I do not believe Watringbury is well placed to offer sites. The village does not have the required infrastructure to function as a Rural Centre (nor become a defacto urban area by being merged with Kings Hill) to support an increased population. It suffers already from serious traffic congestion and has a most limited retail and service offering. Many of the sites proposed for consideration would destroy areas of outstanding and accessible countryside of Grade 1 and 2 farmlands, with landscapes of great character. In addition, there are a range of difficult access issues and concerns around fresh water supply and the water table in certain areas of the village.</p> <p>2.1) General Objections applying to all sites around Watringbury</p> <p>(i) Water. During the summer drought of 2022 there were occasions in Canon Lane (and perhaps more widely in the village), when South- East Water was unable to provide a fresh water supply. TMBC will need to be satisfied that, with climate change, the village is supported with adequate fresh water supplies and infrastructure to meet its existing needs, let alone the demands of new housing.</p> <p>(ii) Environment. The proposals in this area will adversely impact the area's CO2 levels from both the new build on greenfield sites and increased traffic flows. The area around the Watringbury crossroads is already the most polluted part of the Borough.</p> <p>The character of this landscape, its wildlife, and the access it provides to the natural environment, should be preserved.</p> <p>In looking at the possible sites around Watringbury, TMBC needs to protect its legacy by minimising greenfield development and look instead elsewhere to other sites already supported with adequate infrastructure where residents are not significantly dependent on their cars to meet their daily needs</p> <p>2.3) Canon Lane</p> <p>Canon Lane is an historical, and in most parts, single track lane rising approximately 60 metres to the north where it terminates in a cul-de-sac against narrow woodland and the housing boundaries of Kings Hill. It is bounded in its lower half by extensive traditional stone walls on either side of the narrow lane which date back several hundred years. Its junction with the Tonbridge Road provides limited visibility and has, we understand, seen fatalities.</p> <p>The lane is popular with walkers and cyclists from Kings Hill and the surrounding area, meeting footpaths to both the East and the West at its higher level and providing at the northern end pedestrian access to Kings Hill.</p> <p>2.4) Site 59800 additional objections</p> <p>(i) Access. Canon Lane is not capable of providing safe access to any further housing developments along its length. As noted above, it is single lane in the most part, heavily frequented by walkers and cyclists, including unaccompanied school children, and has a dangerous exit on to the Tonbridge Road.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how access to this proposed site can be achieved without obtaining additional rights of way from Kings Hill by demolishing houses on that estate to establish a roadway. Canon Lane itself is entirely unsuitable for higher volumes of traffic.</p> <p>(ii) Water table. During the summer of 2022 the small lake shown on the site plan drained, caused, we understand, by a sinkhole which had opened up. This has affected the water table flowing down parts of the hill side leaving empty a further large pond downstream in the water infrastructure which had existed for over a hundred years or more. Subject</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>to expert advice, any further housing developments on the higher reaches of the lane (either this site or site 59802 to the east) could have further effects on the natural flows of water with potential adverse consequences.</p> <p>2.5). Site 59802 objections</p> <p>(i) Amenity values and landscape of character. Site 59802 comprises well managed vineyards and, until recently, productive agricultural fields which have been set aside for reasons which are unclear.</p> <p>To the north it bounds and provides footpath access to Cattering Woods which we understand are a protected area. To the south it has exceptional views across miles of beautiful countryside, woodlands and hills providing a landscape of great character. These views would also be significantly damaged by development of the possible sites in the area of Pizien Well on the opposite side of the valley.</p> <p>The footpaths that cross the proposed site provide attractive walking routes to the north, east and south and are heavily frequented particularly by residents of Kings Hill. If these footpaths are eliminated with new build, the recreational walking areas available to these residents in this local area will be constrained largely to a single narrow footpath around the perimeter of the golf course to the west. The farmland comprising this site provides an important amenity for the encouragement of mental well-being and exercise, and access to the natural environment with its wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>With climate change, the well managed recent development of vineyards on this site has provided an attractive alternative use of the farmland bringing sustainable employment opportunities. Vineyards provide an important agricultural evolution for the region with a growing economic contribution to the County, including local tourism, and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The loss of such an outstanding site to the community, to the local character of this part of the Kentish countryside, and the growing evolution of its agricultural contribution and example, would have significant impact.</p> <p>This land should be protected as one of the treasures of the area .</p> <p>Canon Lane does not offer a safe or appropriate access. In addition it is not clear how access from the east can be secured without cutting through Cattering Woods which are protected.</p>	
42586177	Question 8	<p>2.1) General Objections applying to all sites around Watlington</p> <p>(i) Traffic. Watlington suffers significant traffic problems at various times of the day sitting on the A26 to Maidstone. In the village the A26 is narrow by modern standards & restricted by residents parked traffic. Pedestrian pavements are narrow and potentially dangerous. Any additional developments will increase traffic flows having environmental and safety impacts. I understand the area around the Watlington crossroads is already the most polluted part of the Borough.</p> <p>(ii) Shops and Services. Watlington does not have an infrastructure of shops and services to support the community, no significant leisure facilities, secondary schools, veterinary services, and very limited health care support. This infrastructure is unable to support further housing growth in the area.</p> <p>(iii) Water. During 2022 there were occasions in the village, when South-East Water was unable to provide a fresh water supply. TMBC will need to be satisfied that, with climate change, the village is properly supported with adequate fresh water supplies and infrastructure to meet its existing needs, let alone the demands of new housing in the future.</p> <p>(iv) Environment. The proposals in this area will adversely impact the area's CO2 levels from both the new build on greenfield sites and increased traffic flows.</p> <p>(v) Health and Well-Being. In all the site cases set out below, we would suggest TMBC's approach to assessing Health and Well-Being has too narrow a focus</p> <p>A number of sites (59654, 59664, 59700, 59728, 59803, 59845 and 59729) reference proximity to existing health care</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		facilities. Personal experience, however demonstrates that these facilities are already inadequate for the existing local population.	
42722305	Question 8	59448 & 59450 are not suitable or available for development. These spaces have been maintained and used by the community for recreational use for over 20 years. 59698 & 59824 are not suitable for development due to landscape constraints and the ability of the rural road network to accommodate traffic movements associated with construction and residential use.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42589153	Question 8	59534 Site , it is proposed to build 18 houses on this site, how is parking going to be arranged, how is road to access to these houses located, how is this not blocking the view of existing home owners of Woodford grove, how is this not destroying the green space which is currently being enjoyed by the residents of Woodford Grove?? How is this not affecting the house price of existing home owners, who is going to compensate them for it? How is additional 18 houses going to solve any housing problem?? With 5000 houses in the plan, how is this 18 house contributing to it, why is this green space needed for building houses, is there no other space that house can be built. I found the idea of building 18 houses in site 59534 ridiculous, impossible to understand, not solving any problem, adding numerous problems for existing residents nearby, if you could explain to me why you think this is a viable idea, i am open to hear.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42614881	Question 8	59595- Access on extremely narrow lane with tractors, cyclists etc. which is not practical. The road could not cope with a large number of cars coming from this site where there is no space for up to 100 houses. 59597- Access onto Mereworth Rd and Seven Mike Lane. This junction is dangerously busy at school times and more cars here would clog up the road even more as well as being a safety issue. 59599 - far too dangerous to have a development's Access our close to Seven Mile Lane and the busy, often congested roundabout close to it. 59811- This is an area of Outstanding Beauty with wonderful views across the Weals of Kent. To build on this would be sacrilege! The roads around it are very narrow and twisty and can not cope with more cars. No bus services run here. It is enjoyed by walkers, cyclist, horse riders and is good agricultural land. No infrastructure for schools, doctors etc. 59750, 58816 - The Street is a very busy cut through between the A228 and Seven MiLane. It is a narrow road and is heavily congested at school times with cars parked on both sides of the road. To add over more than 100 houses would not only spoil the character of the village in its rural setting but also cause more traffic chaos. Again the infrastructure with schools, doctors etc is no pt. there. 59758 - beautiful farm land and woodland enjoyed by horse riders, walkers etc. Also stables here and a home which potentially go. Extremely narrow road and very poor access. Would ruin a lovely part of Mereworth. 59749, 59752, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59754,59757,59761- The roads can not cope with these developments and neither can our present surgeries, primary schools (no secondary school in the area), and other services. Mereworth and West Peckham are in danger of being overspill for the massive Kings Hill development and lose their rural and beautiful village identities.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746305	Question 8	<p>59595, 59597, 59598, 59599, 59747, 59749, 59750, 59752, 59754, 59755, 59757, 59758, 59759, 59760, 59761, 59816, 59846, 59811</p> <p>The villages impacted do not have the infrastructure, the schools, the doctors, dentists, the public transport, the road capacity to have additional developments. The agricultural heart of these villages would be materially impacted. The quality of air, the biodiversity, the flora and fauna which has been protected over centuries by conservation would be lost. There are NO health and well-being benefits.</p> <p>Build the houses in brown field sites, in fill in towns and cities - once you destroy Green belt land, historic villages, farming - you destroy communities. The garden of England is lost FOREVER.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42709409	Question 8	<p>59597 - within flood risk area.</p> <p>59598 - this is heavily forested and important to biodiversity.</p> <p>59599 - missing from Annex 1</p> <p>59750 - heavily flood prone.</p> <p>59752 - heavily flood prone.</p> <p>59754 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape</p> <p>59755 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape</p> <p>59757 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape</p> <p>59758 - heavily flood prone.</p> <p>59759 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape</p> <p>59760 - poor access, biodiversity, landscape.</p> <p>59816 - missing from Annex 1</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42801793	Question 8	<p>59597 disagree with assessment for obj 1, 3, 5,6,7,9,10,13and 14</p> <p>They are all Significant negative</p> <p>All the sites around Oxenhoath this is West Peckham not Hadlow</p> <p>59806</p> <p>59811</p> <p>How on earth can building in an area of natural beauty, risk to flooding , narrow lanes be acceptable</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42589057	Question 8	<p>59601 greenbelt land, prone to flooding.</p> <p>59637 greenbelt land, prone to flooding, and site is on a narrow lane.</p> <p>59638 greenbelt land, prone to flooding, and detrimental to wildlife, as immediately behind a pond.</p> <p>59647 and 59853 Court lane is a narrow, busy lane, prone to flooding.</p> <p>59776 Carpenters lane already has too much traffic to handle any more.</p> <p>59811 greenbelt land. beautiful land belonging to Historic Oxenhoath estate, again, surrounded by narrow lanes, Carpenters Lane would again be impacted.</p> <p>All other sites in Hadlow are prone to flooding, and would impact on local roads and amenities. Hadlow Medical Centre is full.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722849	Question 8	<p>59608</p> <p>This is a very inaccessible place - it will go down a road that can only fit one car wide to reach it from Back Lane and the amount of traffic generated by 37 homes, especially causing air pollution to arise while cars wait to let each other past to reach the drive way into the plot around the rows of cottages on either side of the drive way. If access is the other side of the house there - cars will be going back and forth right up to the garden of cottage there - with 37houses - that is at least 37 cars if not more going back and forth - increasing air pollution levels.</p> <p>This plot is an area of outstanding natural beauty and opposite a nature reserve which preserves a very delicate ecosystem for a native plant -as a nursery it is already very environmentally friendly and offers biodiversity and greenery amongst the flowers and plants it grows - inside and outside greenhouses and the open beds. It is difficult to see how housing would improve the soil - given the site is a nursery.</p> <p>It is very much a going concern - I am not sure why an existing good business would be turned over to residential housing. and it would presumably disrupt the other business down that drive way. It seems that it would be difficult to argue that it improved sustainability for the economy by changing it to residential.</p> <p>There is only a very limited bus service at the end of the road that mostly works during school times and is likely to be closed down - school children in this area essentially need cars to get to the school bus stops - where there is a bus or to get to school. The buses have been reduced and cancelled - so people living here have to have cars - and the access here is not able to cope with that many cars. It is not near a school or medical facility.</p> <p>We are near Ightham Mote and further cars can cause problems with access to that house given the narrow single track lanes around here.</p> <p>Overall it seems that this would bring a lot of congestion to the area especially giving limited accessibility of the site , as well as destroy open space next to AONB without the benefits of improving economic situation and helping people get houses in places where they can easily get to work, school and medical facilities.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42831361	Question 8	<p>59623 - This site is a significant corner in the middle of a conservation area. This house is in character for the area whereas replacement with multiple units would inherently not be under the conservation area description. It has been scored incorrectly therefore as the role it plays in the conservation area has been ignored.</p> <p>59417 - It would appear this is marked as withdrawn. If that is not correct I would wish to comment.</p> <p>59683 - This is the worst sort of proposal which would involve removing highly valued, well used recreational space. If lost it would be impossible to replace and cause further congestion and stress on local facilities and transport links.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Heritage Strategy.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42726305	Question 8	<p>59637 - This site is designated as Green Belt and is unsuitable for development. A footpath passes through the middle of the site and development would have a significant negative effect on users. There are important views of Hadlow tower across the site from the cemetery where there is a Grade 2 listed war memorial. Development of the site would detract from this viewpoint and the openness of the Green Belt as well as adversely affect the tranquility of the cemetery. The site is also prone to flooding and provides important natural flood attenuation to the surrounding areas. The site is also graded agricultural land the loss of which could impinge on the agricultural economy and the rural character of the village. Access to the site from Cemetery Lane is unsuitable for the residential and construction traffic that would be generated by development. Cemetery lane is narrow and would be overwhelmed by traffic if any development were to proceed. It is already a 'rat run' at peak times and can be dangerous. Development that causes additional traffic generation should be discouraged. The site is not well connected to the village services and there is no safe cycle or pedestrian route. Finally, the site acts as an important habitat and significant loss of biodiversity would occur should development be permitted.</p> <p>59638 - The junction of the access road with the A26 is dangerous due to visibility and speed of traffic. The location of the site next to the pond would impact water quality of the pond and associated wildlife. The site is Green Belt and in agricultural use. Development would adversely affect the rural setting of the pond and the surrounding trees. There is no safe cycling route to Hadlow and Tonbridge beyond.</p> <p>59686 - Same comments as for 59638 above. Also, Hadlow Medical Centre is oversubscribed with no room for expansion. Large scale green field development in the village will add pressure to the medical centre and other public services. It will also overwhelm existing infrastructure.</p> <p>59605 - This site is green belt and any development is inappropriate. An unlawful residential development has been undertaken to the site which is the subject of enforcement action and an appeal. The unlawful development should be a material consideration in any decision over its future allocation. Development of the site resulted in destruction of habitat, and any allocation should seek to re-establish this to repair damaged biodiversity. The site is not well connected to the village and access to the site is unsafe on highways grounds given the closeness of the A26 junction.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42651777	Question 8	<p>59637 Any development on the site would have a significant negative effect for existing users of the footpath and for visitors to the Cemetery on their enjoyment of the countryside and views of the Grade II listed Hadlow Tower. The site is also prone to regular flooding and run-off from any development could affect the health of the nearby pond. There is no infrastructure to allow safe cycling around Hadlow and between the village and Tonbridge. Access would involve significant development of other green belt land.</p> <p>59638 The junction of the access road with the A26 is dangerous due to visibility and the speed of traffic using the A26. The location of the site next to the pond would impact the quality of the water in the pond and the wildlife that use it. The site is Green Belt and agricultural land (regularly used for grazing sheep). Any development would adversely impact the rural setting of the pond, currently with trees and field behind it. There is no infrastructure to allow safe cycling around Hadlow and between the village and Tonbridge.</p> <p>59686 The Hadlow medical centre is over-subscribed with no room for expansion. The junction of the proposed access road with the A26 is dangerous. The site is Green Belt and agricultural land (regularly used for grazing sheep). There is no infrastructure to allow safe cycling around Hadlow and between the village and Tonbridge.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Heritage Strategy.
45184545	Question 8	<p>59645, 59699, 59714 and 59716 outside the villages boundary. There is insufficient GP facilities 645 has recently had planning refused. All have top grade agricultural soil sites were not submitted on previous plan as were not viable with the exception on 714.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42707297	Question 8	<p>59657 - i agree broadly with ratings, however would just encourage that this area must be packed with bio-diversity such is the growth of green material within this area. I would also recommend it be noted that the entry and exit junction proposed is opposite Higham Lane onto an already very busy Hadlow Road/ Cornwallis Avenue. This will only contribute to congestion.</p> <p>59834 - agree broadly with ratings but would like it noted that entry and exit is onto a very busy Hadlow road, the size of the development proposed would exacerbate this. It's placed directly on a flood plain, with potential to cause not only issues for itself but further down stream. It should also be noted that this area is naturally very stunning and many people enjoy it's beauty every day, both on the river and land. Altering it's appearance and use through development on the proposed scale will change everything about it and Tonbridge forever.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42758785	Question 8	<p>59673- yet more traffic on to Mill Street a narrow road, at probably it's narrowest point</p> <p>59824- again access on to a narrow rural road. Too many houses too little infrastructure to sustain.</p> <p>59450 and 59448. - A green space on a large development. Totally unacceptable to build on it !!</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42060609	Question 8	<p>59683: Very unclear map but appears to obliterate all outdoor sports facilities from north Tonbridge which is a deprived area. I would like to see a map where I could read the street names.</p> <p>59623: already refused at planning committee for reasons including a popular characterful house which is unsuitable for the overcrowding of the plot and very dangerous road safety for entrance onto Shipbourne Road and YPR</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study,
44986273	Question 8	<p>59685 59721 59690 59805 59693 59809</p> <p>1. object to any development on the sites</p> <p>A. form vital part of metropolitan green belt</p> <p>B. consists of most productive and valuable agricultural land</p> <p>C. prone to flooding and contained hidden springs</p> <p>D. will make traffic situations worse especially at peak times</p> <p>E. Loss of biodiversity</p> <p>F. will totally and irrevocably alter character of north Tonbridge</p> <p>G. negative impact on town centre H sites will not be easy accessible to shops schools medical facilities etc.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42439617	Question 8	<p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites because they form a vital part of the metropolitan green belt fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF they consist of the Best Most Valuable agricultural land. the war in Ukraine has highlighted the importance of this . The MAFF survey of April 1991 confirms this classification They are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain springs which bubble when the land is saturated. Existing peak traffic congestion will be worsened A significant loss of biodiversity The open semi rural character of north Tonbridge would be no more Even more stress on education and local health services A negative impact on the centre of town due to the expansion of the boundaries These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42604961	Question 8	<p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to development on these sites for these reasons:</p> <p>a) They are part of the essential Green Belt. They have not been included in any previous development plan. b) The areas are productive and most valuable agricultural land. The classification was assessed in previous surveys. c) The areas are very prone to flooding and the land becomes easily saturated. d) Development of these areas would increase traffic and create greater strain on the feeder roads to Hadlow Road and Shipbourne Road. These are Barchester Way and Higham Lane. e) Development would lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. f) The character of North Tonbridge is that of being open, semi-rural and low density. g) Development would create more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. h) Development would have a negative impact on the functioning of the Town Centre due to expansion of the town boundaries and the resultant population increase. i) The areas are not easily accessible to the local facilities such as shops.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42759393	Question 8	<p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809 Grange Farm and Greentrees.</p> <p>This land is in the Green Belt and of a high quality for productive farming and has been actively used as such throughout the 49 years I have lived next to it.</p> <p>What is more important that quality farm land to provide the food we need!</p> <p>This ground is well known for flooding.</p> <p>All roads into Tonbridge Town are already overloaded with traffic and not only during peak times. The local roads are also very busy and while some have traffic calming, which fails in its objective, the "Rat Runs" avoiding the main roads are dangerous due to the vollume of cars using them now.</p> <p>The local doctors surgery was recently closed, moving into the centre of Tonbridge, this practice is already struggling to cope.</p> <p>The proposed developments with Tunbridge wells Borough Council are right on the border with Tonbridge and therefor Tonbridge will become a full on nightmare with traffic issues.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42647393	Question 8	<p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809 These sites are part of land known as Grange Farm and Green Trees</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the MGB fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why there were not included in the previous development plan 2. They consist of productive, best most valuable agricultural land (grades1,2,3a), the importance of which have been highlighted by the recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine and Brexit. The MAFF survey report (April 1991) carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3. They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4 Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading in and out of Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will become further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the TWBC local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane, Hunt Road and Whistler Road. 5. Deveopment will lead to a significant loss in biodiversity 6. Deveopment will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural low-density character of north Tonbridge 7. It will put even more stress on the already stretched local doctors, vets, dentists and education services (schools, special schools, nurseries, social support) 8. There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		boundaries and consequent population increase, including parking, railway parking. 9. These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities such as medical facilities	
45181473	Question 8	59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809. Part of Green Belt. Productive agricultural land. Access issues, congestion, loss of biodiversity, strain on education and health services.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42760257	Question 8	59685. 59690. 59693. 59721. 59805. 59809 The Grange Farm and Grentrees areas are subject to flooding. Roads in this area are already congested and are frequently used at peak times to avoid congestion on the A26. Development in this area will put further strain on overstretched local services and cause more congestion.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42615649	Question 8	59691: Agree with site assessment, not sustainable 59840: I do not agree that the whole of this site qualifies as brownfield land. The eastern part of the site has derelict buildings and structures that is brownfield land and is appropriate for development. Parts of the remainder of the site were subject to landfill that has now blended into the landscape and sustains wildlife. Development of this site would also be highly visible within the AONB. 59708: The questions do not seem relevant to small developments. In principle a small development is possible however there are issues such as access over private land, safety due to a popular village preschool and the widely accessed public footpath. 59863: Agree with site assessment, not sustainable 59864/66: Part of this site is within Birling although it is not acknowledged in the consultation. The site is adjacent to an area of Special Scientific Interest, highly visible from AONB and is Grade 2 farmland."	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42473025	Question 8	59720 59871 59709 59830 59608 overdevelopment in Greenbelt and AONB email with specific details to follow.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42556065	Question 8	59720, 59871, 59793 and 59709 - the access to these sites is severely compromised. The proposed development will lead to significant congestion at the Borough Green roundabout and on the A25 and Borough Green Road. This area is already gridlocked at rush hour. Has anyone even been to look at the build up of traffic between 7.30 and 9am and between 3.30 and 6pm?? The consequential increase in air pollution is extremely concerning and there is a significant public health risk. Increased traffic through the village of Ightham will also impact the integrity of the numerous listed buildings, many of which are positioned very close to the road. Where will the children from these new houses go to school? Ightham only has one small village school which lacks capacity for more pupils. 59608 - Ismays Road is a narrow country lane. It cannot sustain the increased level of traffic which will result from building 37 houses (never mind the construction vehicles!) 59770 - Rectory Lane is another narrow country lane. Access to the already busy A25 will be increasingly difficult. Sometimes it takes several minutes to drive out onto the A25 from these side roads and accidents are very commonplace. Building in areas such as this will only increase congestion and occurrences of accidents. The above potential sites must also been seen as a whole and not just individually as many of these sites are adjacent to each other and therefore the impact of development is far more acute. We are looking at more than 270 new houses in a village! 59830 - this is the most worrying and potentially damaging of all the plans. A huge development which is totally unsustainable. The infrastructure is simply not there and the impact on the local community, wildlife, local services, traffic congestion and pollution is unimaginable.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42774945	Question 8	59720,59608,59871,59793,59709,59872,59770,59830, are either precious AONB or GB.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42591265	Question 8	59745 is green belt, has large number of large protected trees. Is a wildlife link to other area, would create issues of privacy and noise issues to existing residents. It would add further traffic to the already over busy B245 road which is the diversion route to the A21 which is closed regularly. B245 floods at junction of Hilden Ave during heavy rain this would be made worse if this area is built on due to further run off going down the hill. This area should be shown as having many serious negatives.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
25049985	Question 8	59748 The assessments do not cover accessibility - a key element for this site which would involve access through narrow residential roads used for car parking by some. 59830 It is extremely doubtful that "the green environment" could be conserved or enhanced.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722945	Question 8	59750 59749 59599 59597 59752 59816 59598 59759 59760 59755 59758 59754 59757 59761 The majority of these sites lie between the B2016, Seven Mile Lane and the A228, Malling Road. These roads are connected via The Street to the south (north of St. Lawrence's church) and to the north by Beech Road. All of these roads have significant problems caused by traffic and in their present conditions are not fit to cope with an increase in traffic volume. The A228 North-South link road is extremely busy. Over 4,000 vehicles an hour pass through a 21ft wide crossroads during rush hours. Every month the daily traffic count increases. An accident or broken down vehicle already causes massive, polluting traffic congestion. Any developments which increase the burden placed on the A228, B2016 and the narrow lanes that interconnect these roads will seriously exacerbate congestion to a busy and dangerously narrow roads. The infrastructure supporting the existing settlements in this area is woefully inadequate and over-stretched. During 2022 there were water shortages and drainage problems in Mereworth and the surrounding area. There is a serious problem with the existing medical practice, covering Kings Hill, West Malling, Offham, West Peckham, Mereworth, Leybourne and the scattered dwellings in between. Dentistry is no better served. There are no secondary schools in the area which are accessible on foot. They all require transport links. The parking problems caused in The Street, not only by Mereworth Primary School, have been ongoing for over 40 years. The Street is regularly brought to a standstill twice a day, on one occasion in 2022 poor parking resulted in a delay of almost three hours. Sites for over 8000 dwellings are proposed for the wider Mereworth area; many of which are neither appropriate nor feasible. The ingress and egress to these sites often involves narrow single track lanes onto fast and/or congested roads which even without additional dwellings at present struggle to cope with the current levels of traffic. Breakdowns and shunts on the A228 and B2016 cause long delays and block the narrow village roads. Beech Road (very narrow, single track) and The Street are 'rat runs' between the B2016 and the A228; Beech Road is regularly used by horse and bicycle Riders as well as walkers. There are very few passing places and those which had been pushed into the fields by	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>constant use have now been closed off, not unreasonably, by the owners or renters of the land.</p> <p>The geology in the Mereworth area is mainly clay and ragstone. This regularly results in sinkholes, some of which are both wide and deep. They begin with a pinhole and develop on investigation into large holes. Those on roads are noticeable but those on the land often go unnoticed until there are the inevitable problems..</p> <p>Development sites under the present proposals would very effectively wipe out the village character of Mereworth. This village was in the Doomsday Book... Its total destruction as a cohesive community would, if only a small proportion of the proposed sites are agreed, be guaranteed. TMBC has a duty surely to not only meet planning requirements but to ensure the continued existence and protect the quality of life of existing settlements.</p>	
42649601	Question 8	<p>59750and 59752 - far too large a development. Current roads (A20 and A26) already very congested with frequent stationary traffic at peak times. Would end up with Mereworth losing its identity</p> <p>59806 - housing numbers far greater than any of the surrounding villages so would change the whole character of the area. Hugely detrimental on biodiversity, air quality, increased demands on transport</p> <p>59624/59723/59799/59722 - too far to walk to local school, particularly due to dangerous nature of roads to walk along. Too distant from shops/facilities. Would need car to live in this location. An area rich in biodiversity which would be lost</p> <p>59797 as above comments plus would cause Wateringbury to lose separate identity from Kings Hill, impact detrimentally on air quality and greater transport/water/education demands</p> <p>59729 too large an impact on the size of Wateringbury, loss of biodiversity, increased congestion on over congested roads</p> <p>59654 - too few number of houses for area</p> <p>59803 negative impact traffic on over congested roads</p> <p>59800/59802 loss of identity Wateringbury from Kings Hill/ access issues</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
45274337	Question 8	<p>59770 Mixed Use. I have the following objections: The site has no access apart from Old Lane. Old Lane is single track and is not a maintained road. It also floods regularly. There is a gate to the field at the corner of Rectory Lane and the A25. However, this was illegally installed by a past owner, Mr. J Slee, to support his unsuccessful application to build houses. The field is sited opposite the Ightham Recreation Park with its large car park and children's playground. The car park caters for parents to drop off and collect children who attend Ightham Primary School. If the proposed site was approved, there would be traffic chaos around the drop off and pick up times, which would increase the risk of traffic accidents involving school children. In addition to the safety issues this development would constitute to the over development of a historical village.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes
42720673	Question 8	<p>59779, 59827, 59825. Totally unsuitable for developments of any size. They would destroy farmland that has, or could, be used for food production. Local roads and junctions are already too narrow and busy, with dangerous junctions and a Primary School adjacent. Everyone would need a car as there are negligible bus services. There are no employers in the village of any size. It already takes 3 weeks to get a doctors appointment. Water is already short. Any of these developments would completely destroy this beautiful village in the Green Belt, and Kent Downs AONB.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38330593	Question 8	<p>59784/59832 - Bell Lane - This is extending a current planning application (TM22/01767) which removes the recreation ground from 59819. (Section 5 Community facilities & Section 1 Climate Change)</p> <p>59819 Agree with</p> <p>59818 - Disagree. Historically used for waste disposal. Site contaminated. With the spoils deposited over many, many years from the old Reed International Works, also fringes on nature reserve. Great crested newt habitat.</p> <p>59820 - Disagree - Planning application Southern Extension (TM/21/01939), observations already submitted.</p> <p>59787 - Disagree - Should retain the Allotment area and community facilities, and landscape impact would be great</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42833313	Question 8	<p>59797 development of this site would result in the closure of the golf course with a negative affect on the health of many people especially elderly golfers who would otherwise get no exercise. Without that exercise the health of the elderly would suffer causing medical issues with further strain on the NHS. It would also remove an area which is home to much wildlife, with a detrimental affect on the environment</p> <p>59596 This is green belt land and should not be developed</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study.
42546721	Question 8	<p>59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869</p> <p>These sites fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>Access to these sites will severely increase an already difficult traffic access issue.</p> <p>Furthermore there has recently been substantial development in the old Fidelity business site and the development of a new large care home. These recent developments will add additional stress on the social care medical care and educational requirement which are already struggling to cope</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42521025	Question 8	<p>59806; 59811</p> <p>Given the site assessment findings I do not understand why these sites are being considered for development.</p> <p>59795</p> <p>This site seems to comprise both green belt and brownfield site. It is situated within green belt land and a development here would be completely out of context, as well as being removed from key infrastructure.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42807137	Question 8	<p>59811 Protecting the countryside: There is currently a considerable amount of wildlife in and around this proposed development site. There are woodpeckers living in the trees along Oxenhoath Road, the bird life is considerable and other wildlife also use the fields. Noise and light pollution and the destruction of wildlife habitat will have a large impact on the remaining wildlife. At the south end of the proposed development is a Zone 3 flood plain, by continuing with the proposed development the large amount of concrete required would mean the land is unable to absorb any water and the run-off of water will be considerable and detrimental to the land and houses already in and around the flood zone and to Tonbridge. There is currently no mains sewage system, private draining systems are realistically unable to be monitored as to being emptied and managed correctly and would also mean a large amount of household waste water being consistently put into the River Bourne and increase the risk of flooding not only in the immediate area but the impact on Tonbridge. There is no mains gas in the area, along with no mains sewage it would require a large amount of disruption to implement, all this disruption is not protecting the countryside it is destroying it. The increased car usage required due to very limited accessibility will increase greenhouse emissions. Well-being – Due to</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study, and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>the poor road access to the proposed development, that it is on a slope therefore difficult for those with mobility challenges and it is not near public transport or amenities are all factors that could be negative to potential residents well-being. If the site is developed there is a high probability that the proposed development will have a negative impact on their mental health of existing local residents due to the destruction of such a beautiful area and increased road traffic meaning that the lanes cannot be used to leisure, the increased light and noise pollution in an area that is currently silent dark at night along with the considerably increased high probability of flooding are all negative and detriment to residents mental health. TMBC need to meet the needs of all their residents and acknowledge some residents require quiet environments for their well-being. Accessibility The main document forward states the aim to reduce traffic, if this proposed site goes ahead it will increase traffic around the lanes. The site is close to a crossroad with High House Lane and Oxenhoath Road, these lane were in the Quiet Lane scheme, both are single track lanes with no verge and very limited passing areas. These lanes are so narrow mainly without verges which inhibits people's abilities to engage in leisure activities such as walking, cycling and horse riding and requires a car to stop or find a passing place to allow both road users to continue. Common Road, which is the road of proposed access to the site, is not a 2 track road, there is no central line, cars have to use off road to pass in most of the places, there is no width for walkers, cyclists or horse riders and two cars to pass. It is approximately 1.3 miles to the A26, which is the nearest public transport, this highlights that due to poor walking and cycling accessibility due to inappropriate roads the only means to get to the A26 for all people living at the proposed site would be by car. In addition to the points discussed above in relations to addition traffic to narrow lanes and the impact of those wanting to use the lanes for leisure and no public transport this leads to forced used of cars for transport. For all potential residents who are unable or do not wish to drive cars then the development is detrimental to their accessibility if there is a disability. The proposed develop is on a slope, for people with mobility difficulties or have to use any walking aid this can mean they are restricted in walking this therefore is isolating to those who fall into this category. Although the proposed development is surrounded by countryside to access footpaths the lanes will also have to be used and most footpaths have styles along them for farmers to control their stock. A style requires a high level of mobility and stability to use therefore this would limit those who would be able to use them to the very able. Your plan promotes a range of housing in developments, I welcome diversity but I do not believe this site would meet the needs of a diverse population, it has too many limitations, housing is required for our aging population, I would suggest for any person who requires health or social care support or has a disability there are limitations regarding accessibility on this proposed site. Providing New Services: If a new transport service was to be implemented careful consideration would have to taken into account as Common Road going towards Plaxtol is very narrow at Four Wents and due to existing housing by the road would need single traffic road control. Supporting Active Travel: Due to the width of the roads – both Common Road (leading into Hamptons Park Road), High House Lane and Oxenhoath Road all being lanes some of which are single track lanes, any additional traffic will reduce the ability to use these lanes for leisure activities in particular walking, cycling and horse riding (new legislation requires passing space of 1.5 metres between a car and a horse). The proposed site of 100+ houses will be extremely detrimental for the ability to use the Quiet Lanes for leisure and the roads around the site will be for car use only due to the increased volume of traffic. Backing Local Businesses: Local business are farmers, they use the local lanes to access their fields driving large farm machinery, additional road use of cars along these lane will be detrimental to allow the farmers to access their land. There are also many businesses who provide services to farms in the area and there would be a negative impact.</p>	
42613985	Question 8	<p>59820 REJECT-planning has already been submitted for this</p> <p>51819 ACCEPT</p> <p>59784/59832 REJECT current planning application in place, includes recreation ground impact on community facilities</p>	Noted. Comments on specific live planning applications are Development Management matters.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42544161	Question 8	<p>59823 and 59821</p> <p>Green Belt: Both of these sites are in the green belt and fulfil the 5 objectives of green belt. They are both on the boundary between Hildenborough and Tonbridge and as such are a GREEN WEDGE. This protects Hildenborough's status as a village and stops it becoming absorbed into the urban sprawl of Tonbridge.</p> <p>Environment: These sites are the start of a large stretch of open country side stretching to Shipbourne and beyond. It has been farmed for decades and development would lead to a significant loss of agricultural land. It provides protection from flooding, includes an historic orchard and attracts a variety of wonderful wildlife. There are 2 historic ponds and many mature trees that would be destroyed forever if developed.</p> <p>Infrastructure: Outside of rush hour, the local bus service is only hourly and the nearest train stations are not within walking distance for most people.</p> <p>The local GP is already under considerable strain especially with the additional building at Fidelity and the new care home in Hildenborough.</p> <p>Both local schools Hildenborough & Stocks Green are oversubscribed.</p> <p>Our school buses are already full to the brim transporting children from Hildenborough and Tonbridge to Tunbridge Wells schools often too full to allow children on.</p> <p>Traffic: Both these sites are approximately 2 miles from the A21 (Morley's Roundabout) and they will result in a considerable amount of traffic joining the already congested B245 towards the A21 and towards the town centre. The adverse affects of pollution on health are well known and there are several schools on these already congested roads.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42461121	Question 8	<p>59830: Previously Borough Green Garden City and rejected by government - far too large a development would destroy local settlements.</p> <p>59493: BG Station car park will need more space not less if more homes built.</p> <p>59492: Western Road car park - essential village resource.</p> <p>59877: Inadequate access.</p> <p>59748: Inadequate access.</p> <p>59843: Off single track lane - impractical.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38330337	Question 8	<p>59861 - no clear infrastructure plans that would add to congestion already occurred in both areas. The plan would see a lot of natural habitat that is existing footpaths that are used regularly damaged. There is also no meeting of objective 1 It would also weaken EMR who own the land ability to research.</p> <p>59856 - Poor road infrastructure with existing complaints on lorries on the last 10 years. The ability will mean the existing development would be damaged or changed.</p> <p>59870 - no clear footpaths to allow access to existing infrastructure so it is not meeting objective 1. The corner is dangerous and the 16 properties would increase traffic which is not considered. There is already properties there.</p> <p>59873 -no clear footpaths to allow access to existing infrastructure so it is not meeting objective 1. The corner is dangerous and the 16 properties would increase traffic which is not considered. There is already properties there.</p> <p>59398 - Poor parking and objections already raised as the current road is not suitable with a clear traffic risk for joining traffics.</p> <p>59397 - Existing objections to site access and the restriction of views of the downs for existing properties.</p> <p>59393 - Pollution levels due to the motorway and light pollution from K Sports</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42413313	Question 8	<p>59861 - Poor road entrance with poor KCC planning on the roads.</p> <p>Removing popular existing footpaths which enhance the public</p> <p>Damage to EMR land and restrict their ability to research. Chemicals used have been an issue in Ditton Edge project.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45654689	Question 8	<p>59865, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809</p> <p>form vital part of green belt its good agricultural land poor access onto rural lanes or already saturated roads especially at rush hour PLUTO pipeline crossing land terrible impact on infrastructure land liable to flooding need to protect biodiversity</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722081	Question 8	<p>59877- I object to this site being used for development.</p> <p>Objection 1- This says it is within an 800M site of a medical centre and sports facility as positives. There is no information about how capacity at the medical centre would be increased so this would just add another strain on an already very busy service- it CANNOT be declared a positive.</p> <p>Objection 3- in regards to local schools. Kent's own published data (/www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/126774/Guide-to-applying-to-Primary-in-Kent.pdf) shows that both local primary schools (Borough Green Primary and Ightham Primary) were both fully subscribed in the most recent year, so I think it would be reasonable to assume that there would not be capacity at these for more applications. Therefore proximity to these schools is not a positive. It is a NEGATIVE as local people will have more difficulty as they compete with more families for the same number of school places. If you are going to remedy this by building a new school- this could be done anywhere.</p> <p>Objection 5 and 6- these are SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVES. This is an areas of established woodland with orchids, lots of species of birds, wildflowers. These areas need to be preserved. Turning them into a building site would have a huge negative effect of the environment.</p> <p>Objection 8- you should not be considering building houses in any flood risk area. The effect on climate change is accelerating and this risk will only increase.</p> <p>Objection 5 and 6- these are SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVES. This is an areas of established woodland with orchids, lots of species of birds, wildflowers. These areas need to be preserved. Turning them into a building site would have a huge negative effect of the environment.</p> <p>Objection 8- you should not be considering building houses in any flood risk area. The effect on climate change is accelerating and this risk will only increase.</p> <p>Objection 14- Large sites are not a positive. They put a huge strain on local amenities. There is no reason why a smaller development should not contain affordable housing- that is completely down to the developer's plan.</p> <p>Site 59843- I object to this site being used for development.</p> <p>Objection 1- This says it is within an 800M site of a medical centre and sports facility as positives. There is no information about how capacity at the medical centre would be increased so this would just add another strain on an already very busy service- it CANNOT be declared a positive.</p> <p>Objection 3- in regards to local schools. Kent's own published data (/www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/126774/Guide-to-applying-to-Primary-in-Kent.pdf) shows that both local primary schools (Borough Green Primary and Ightham Primary) were both fully subscribed in the most recent year, so I think it would be reasonable to assume that there would not be capacity at these for more applications. Therefore proximity to these schools is not a positive. It is a NEGATIVE as local people will have more difficulty as they compete with more families for the same number of school places. If you are going to remedy this by building a new school- this could be done anywhere</p> <p>Objection 5 and 6- these are SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVES. This is an areas of established woodland with orchids, lots of species of birds, wildflowers.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>These areas need to be preserved. Turning them into a building site would have a huge negative effect of the environment.</p> <p>Site 59748 I object to this site being used for development.</p> <p>Objection 1- This says it is within an 800M site of a medical centre and sports facility as positives. There is no information about how capacity at the medical centre would be increased so this would just add another strain on an already very busy service- it CANNOT be declared a positive.</p> <p>Objection 3- in regards to local schools. Kent's own published data (/www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/126774/Guide-to-applying-to-Primary-in-Kent.pdf) shows that both local primary schools (Borough Green Primary and Ightham Primary) were both fully subscribed in the most recent year, so I think it would be reasonable to assume that there would not be capacity at these for more applications. Therefore proximity to these schools is not a positive. It is a NEGATIVE as local people will have more difficulty as they compete with more families for the same number of school places. If you are going to remedy this by building a new school- this could be done anywhere</p> <p>Objection 5 and 6- these are SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVES. This is an areas of established woodland with orchids, lots of species of birds, wildflowers.</p> <p>These areas need to be preserved. Turning them into a building site would have a huge negative effect of the environment.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42683265	Question 8	<p>59881 No Reasons. Not connected to a settlement the site is on rising ground and will dominate the surrounding rural area. The location is not sustainable, distant from an established settlement, public transport and local amenities. The development would damage heritage assets including the protected park and the setting of a number of listed buildings for which an isolated rural or parkland setting is key to their significance. The development would be a huge hole in the Green Belt with no mitigating circumstances. The development would significantly contribute to more car traffic on quiet rural lanes before adding to the existing congestion on the A26.</p> <p>59601 No Reasons. The site is in the flood plain of the River Bourne and is regularly flooded. Development would restrict the natural capacity of the land to cope with run off and will lead to more serious flooding down stream. The site is beyond the established village boundary and would intrude into a key view of the tower and the village from the A26, which is cited as important for the character of the village and would damage the setting of the listed building. It is important for the character of the village that this hard south west edge remains and is not absorbed by suburban sprawl. The site had ecological significance with habitat for a number of protected species along the river edge, including water voles and dormice. Development of the site would add further traffic to the congested A26 corridor.</p> <p>69859 No Reasons. The site is in the flood plain of the River Bourne and is regularly flooded. Development would restrict the natural capacity of the land to cope with run off and will lead to more serious flooding down stream. The site is beyond the established village boundary and would intrude into a key view of the Maltings and the village from the A26, which is cited as important for the character of the village and would damage the setting of the listed building. It is important for the character of the village that this hard south west edge remains and is not absorbed by suburban sprawl. The site had ecological significance with habitat for a number of protected species along the river edge, including water voles and dormice. Development of the site would add further traffic to the congested A26 corridor.</p> <p>59776 No The site is currently a field utilised in conjunction with the adjacent sports field by the village hall as much needed outdoor amenity for the village families. In rural areas paradoxically, public open space is in short supply compared with urban areas, as no particular provision is made for parks or amenity spaces and the surrounding land is private and cultivated, so this is a valuable resource. It would also provide the only suitable location for a new school to meet the needs of new housing. Any development of the site will add more traffic onto Carpenter's Lane, already too narrow for existing parking and traffic. The junction to the A26 is dangerous and the A26 is already too congested.</p> <p>59842 No. Reasons. The site is prone to run off flooding and is unsuitable for residential development. If it is developed the run off will flood elsewhere in the village. The location will add traffic stress to Carpenters Lane and the junction with A26 which are already unable to safely cope with existing traffic. It will add to the congestion on the A26 and further damage the air quality in the centre of the village. It extends a significant distance north of the settlement into the Green Belt and would be an incongruous intrusion into this rural area, as well as being unsustainably too far from amenities. The development would prevent any future Northern by pass to allow traffic to be taken away from the centre of the village. The pressure of new development along the A26 is particularly damaging for Hadlow which is the only major settlement on the key route between Tonbridge, for the A21, and Kings Hill, for the M20, which is having a disastrous impact on living conditions within the settlement, with congestion, noise and poor air quality. The only way to prevent the further degrading of living conditions in Hadlow would be by provision of a bypass.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>59638. No. Reasons. The site is prone to flooding, unsuitable for development and further restriction of run off would raise flood risks up stream. Development of the site would damage the setting of a listed building. A26 access on the bend would be dangerous and add to the existing congestion and pollution on the A26 corridor and in the centre of Hadlow.</p> <p>59637 No. The site is an unacceptable and incongruous extension of the settlement boundary into the Green Belt and would damage the rural setting of surrounding lanes. It would add considerably to traffic along the narrow Cemetery Lane which has a tight access to A26 with limited forward visibility and be dangerous for residents and passing traffic. Part of the site is prone to flooding and any development would restrict natural run off, increasing flood risks. Development of the site would damage the isolated rural setting of a listed building.</p> <p>59686 No. The site is back land, without direct highway access, and so relies on other sites. It will add to the congestion and pollution on the A26 through Hadlow.</p> <p>59647. No. The development would add considerable traffic and congestion to Court lane, a narrow country lane, unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, and with a difficult tight junction to the A26. The development will take suburban strip development a long way beyond Hadlow into the rural area to the east, with a detrimental impact on the Green Belt. The development will add traffic to the already congested and polluting A26, through Hadlow and into Tonbridge.</p> <p>59635 No. A planning application has already been submitted and objections have been placed on the unreasonable loss of rural character, inappropriate design, impact on the setting of listed buildings, loss of ecological habitat and traffic and congestion i</p>	
42834017	Question 8	<p>59890, 59805, 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721</p> <p>These sites form a vital part of the green belt. Development will worsen already congested roads. It will put a strain on healthcare providers and on education.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42822209	Question 8	A full review of all sites should be taken out prior to any being included within this consultation. Without a comprehensive review of each site, how can you expect anyone to comment on them as a whole.	Comments noted.
42483905	Question 8	A number of the sites along the Igtham bypass would lead to unattractive development, blight for existing home owners, and potentially dangerous volumes of traffic. In particular I would object to sites numbered 59770, 59709, 59720, 59872 and especially 59871	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42230369	Question 8	<p>A systematic and sequential approach should be taken to the assessment of all sites in the Green Belt. I suggest four stages in that consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Can the release of the site for development be avoided? 2. If not, is the release proposed the minimum necessary? 3. Can the (minimum) loss be mitigated - for example by on site measures? 4. Can the loss be replaced (for example by equal provision elsewhere)? <p>Sites 59747, 59749, 59750, 59806 and 59811are (among others) in the gap between Kings Hill and Hadlow, and should be avoided for development. The SAR does not recognise sufficiently the "gap" function as an important arm of National Green Belt policy. Site 59811 is also an important Listed Building with local importance to its parkland setting.</p> <p>Site 59842 is too small and isolated from the boundary of Hadlow to warrant site-specific identification. Any proposals there should be initiated (and dealt with) through the normal development control process. This and other northward extensions of Hadlow (both to the east and west of A26 should be assessed against sustainability criteria (currently absent) that take account of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The character, appearance and functions of Common Road (which is an attractive and well-used entry point to the Bourne Valley and the AONB, and for important agricultural traffic from housing development) and of Cemetery Lane (which has similarly limited traffic capacity and serves additionally as the "processional route" to the village cemetery, demanding a measure of quietude). If development is to be permitted adjacent to Lonewood Way and for sites further along Common Road to then west, they should be served from an existing access directly to A26(designed and built by KCC some years ago, but not currently used) 2. the hazardous junctions of both Common Road and Cemetery Lane with A26. Common Road would benefit here from a "right turning entry lane" from A26 and both would benefit with a slower speed limit on their approaches. 3. the dangerous bends at the junction of Common Road and Matthews Lane and Carpenters Lane, both of which should be re-aligned, and the many dangerous bends and accesses already existing along Cemetery Lane. 4. The need for safer crossings to the bus stops serving both Common Road and Cemetery Lane. <p>None of these factors figure in the SAR</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42823873	Question 8	<p>A wide selection of the sites identified are on green belt land, which should be protected for the below reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 59693 – Residential • Site 59685 – Mixed Use • Site 59721 – Residential • Site 59690 – Mixed Use • Site 59805 – Mixed Use • Site 59809 – Mixed Use <p>Protected Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West European Hedgehog (<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>) • White Admiral (<i>Limenitis Camilla</i>) • Grass Snake (<i>Natrix Helvetica</i>) • Crosswort (<i>Cruciata laevipes</i>) • Additional protected species have been identified, but due to data restriction the surveys are not able to be shared with any external party, therefore a protected species survey is necessitated <p>Pen Stream</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFD water body sensitive to sediment management • WFD water body sensitive to gravel removal • Salmonid river • Increase downstream risk of flooding from land changes of farmland to housing <p>Environmental and Country Stewardship Schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land provides winter cover crops <p>Surface Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is at risk of flooding from surface water at the 1 in 30, 1 in 100, and 1 in 1000 event • Any housing development would increase this surface flood risk to the wider area including the A26 Hadlow Road East <p>Utilities and Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil pipeline operated by GPSS (Sites 59690, 59805 59809 only) • Higham Lane and Cuckoo Lane are insufficient for any potential housing development • Existing primary and secondary schools are already at capacity • Only 1 existing GP surgery, which is at capacity 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
45425121	Question 8	<p>a. Site 59417 is currently an educational facility. A development on the site as described would likely see the business close. The school is not only an educator of local children but also a significant local employer. The undeveloped part of the site is part of the floodplain due to its proximity to a water course.</p> <p>b. Site 59623 is at a prominent point in a conservation area. Development would likely cause harm to sense of place. A recent planning application (Planning Application: 21/01677/FL) to develop it was refused on the grounds of loss of amenity for neighbour and inappropriate development in the conservation area. Site access is limited and developing the access onto Shipbourne Road would exacerbate an already-existing pinch point that frequently cause tailbacks. On sustainability grounds, surely a better use for the site would be to enhance the existing structure rather than knock down a perfectly fine building.</p> <p>c. Site 59683 is a significant site of amenity and recreational space, and a floodplain.</p> <p>d. Site 59588 is a well-used car park that is part of the setting for Tonbridge Castle and immediately adjacent to an amenity space. This is not a viable location for a dwelling.</p> <p>e. Sites 59586 and 59587 appear to be part of the Fosse scheduled monument in Tonbridge. Development of the site may cause significant harm to the monument. A planning inspector refused appeal for development of the site in November 2021 and it appears to have later been approved, at least in part (Planning Application: 21/01911/FL ; Appeal Ref: APP/H2265/W/20/3265741). An archaeological investigation (Wessex Archaeology 2010) found significant evidence of early mediaeval occupation of the site.</p> <p>f. Site 59591 is a small patch of amenity space in the middle of a recently developed residential area. Development would be a loss of amenity space for the community.</p> <p>g. 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 are amenity spaces for our communities and should not be sites for development</p> <p>h. Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59735, 59746, 59764, 59798, 59690, 59765, 59801, 59804, 59809, 59834, 59835 are all green belt sites on the outskirts of Tonbridge and significant developments in these areas would lack infrastructure and likely cause the existing infrastructure to be overwhelmed</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42690401	Question 8	Again - nobody is going through them all!	Comment noted.
42806945	Question 8	Again as in my response to Question 7, my response has been covered in my earlier answers. I am totally against any development comprised in the title 'Borough Green Garden City' for reasons given in earlier responses. I apologise but I do have the appropriate site reference numbers to hand.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes
42457825	Question 8	Again cannot make sense of it	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
42166369	Question 8	Again, the finding of the surveys are extremely lengthy and unclear. Perhaps these surveys should be communicated in clearer ways so that people already living and working in the area can understand them. Or perhaps they're shared this way precisely so that there are minimal readers and therefore minimal objections?	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
42814881	Question 8	Again, very superficial and not helpful	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
42803649	Question 8	Agricultural and food production are omitted. As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, and the food insecurity experienced during lockdown, maintaining and growing our own UK production is more important than ever before. We cannot afford to lose Best, Most Valuable agricultural land to development. Environmental sustainability must imply the production of more home-grown food.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42788801	Question 8	All sites need to meet wildlife and habitat conservation as a primary consideration rather than secondary alongside human activities.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
25259649	Question 8	All these sites are within water meadows and in a flood plain. In the areas it constantly overflows and are prone to localised flooding + runoff to adjoining field from a very long railway embankment.	The Council will be preparing evidence, including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
46163713	Question 8	Answer: I do not agree with the methodology used by this study. For example the Borough Green Gardens site is treated as a single unit spatially. In reality it is 5 different quarries all at different stages of quarrying. There is no point in ticking a box twice because part of the site is close to a station if the other end of the site is miles away. There is no point on ticking a box because there is a local school when it is obvious that an extra 3,000 families will need multiple new school forms and huge infrastructure that's currently not present. It would be far better to make a serious attempt to quantify the infrastructure required, including an end to end 'Relief Road', and estimating costs it in order to determine if the proposal is even viable. Can a road be built in time given that the quarries keep extending their time horizon to complete quarrying?	The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan
38756449	Question 8	Any site in the Green Belt should not be developed, and in particular rural settlements should not be extended. New settlements should if needed should be close to existing motorways, hospitals etc	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42446049	Question 8	Appendix D does not show the details of the individual sites, just the criteria to be used to assess them. Paragraph D6 relating to healthcare is yet again totally unrealistic in relation to healthcare. Current GP surgeries are overwhelmed in West Malling and Kings Hill, and to assume that building more houses near the surgery means that new residents will be able to access healthcare is naive. More GPs, nurses and receptionists will be needed together with increased funding for drugs. How will these be funded?	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42036737	Question 8	Appendix D sets out the criteria for assessing the various sites. These are fairly standard criteria use in sustainability appraisals. The next step needs to be to assess the existing facilities in the various settlements and to see what benefits new planned development could bring. For instance, Addington currently has a pub, café and community hall. Despite a lot of development over recent years no new facilities have been provided. New planned development could go hand in hand with additional facilities and enhanced public transport provision.	The SA objectives and sub objectives for assessing sites were set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (January 2022). This was subject to consultation with the required consultation bodies including the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England.
44274145	Question 8	As a general overview, Site 59707 is located to the south of Kemsing Road and the west of Borough Green Road. It extends to approximately 4 hectares and is located immediately adjacent to the built confines of Wrotham. Given the size of the site, existing adjacent development patterns and rural housing density indicators it is considered that the site could accommodate between 100 to 130 dwellings.	Comments regarding the distribution of development noted.
42438273	Question 8	As a principle most sites appear to have very little positives and a number of negatives. These represent destruction of greenbelt/rural landscape, increased pressure on already challenged infrastructure and adverse environmental impact.	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.
42021761	Question 8	As I am not familiar with many of these sites I cannot comment	Comments noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42729441	Question 8	As mentioned before the existing developed Kings Hill should not be added to, it has not enough green space, it was planned and accepted as is, its facilities are overrun and do not meet current capacity requirements. The golf course should not be touched, gives employment and recreational area and sold as part of the original plan which TMBC had major input to.	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.
42773473	Question 8	As previously stated sites in the Green Belt & the AONB should not have been put forward as an option for development specifically the three sites in Shipbourne - 59779, 59825 and 59827. The findings to not match local knowledge. 1. Back lane has dangerous junctions at both ends & is used as cut through for A road access. Access to the sites would overrun the local roads and make junctions more dangerous. 2. Local Infrastructure Water & utilities would need significant upgrades (there is no town Gas network). 3. Land drainage currently is not good on site 59827 where overflows into private properties already happen on a yearly basis as the local stream & drainage cannot cope. 4. Local Primary Schools are oversubscribed already & would not be able to accept the increased No's of children associated with the increase in family's moving into a development in the Village. 5. There is no identified need for social housing in Shipbourne, So a mixed development on this site is debatable.	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.
42441185	Question 8	As Q7 t's clear that TM Borough Northeast region offers more readily available "areas of interest" for meeting development requirements, due to former industrial use of land. Using TMBC 2040 vision to meet NPPF requirements.	Comments regarding the distribution of development noted.
42585633	Question 8	Assessment is not balanced and does not cover overall impact, placing the validity of the assessment in severe doubt e.g. building on car parks in West Malling does not consider impact of loss of these resources on local businesses and vibrancy of village or the other local hubs, building on Hoath Wood has been designated brownfield when much of it is Ancient Woodland protected by TPO's Site 59424 DEFRA Forest Inventory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees • Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill • Harm to protected species • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Impact on Local Residents of main access • Impact on wildlife corridor Site 59531 Change of character of the area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space • Soak-away area for local roads; removal will result in more flooding Site 59534 Change of character of the area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space • Site 59544 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Harm to non-listed heritage assets, preservation order • Site 59547 Loss of Green Open Space	The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • <p>Site 59630</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59631</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Public Open Space for Kings Hill • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59634</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Ancient Woodland and TPOs (Most of site) • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59655</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59740</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Inadequate resources – KCC indicate suggested school location not economic, no retail centre 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59752</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>Site 59761</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland (Part of site) • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>Site 59797</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59800</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59802</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59884</p> <p>Example reasons for objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42716289	Question 8	<p>Assessments too generic and not reviewed in enough detail</p> <p>Site no 59850 - East Street, Addington The assessment is far too generic This site is clearly unsuitable :-</p> <p>Green-belt land Protected OS1a land as shown in TMBC strategy policy 75m away from Area of outstanding natural beauty Size of site would double size of Addington Village No schools close by Infrastructure is already busy for a village Important open space - current golf course Public rights of way with beautiful open views Loss of amenity value for the village Wildlife habitat - newts, bats, dormice, badgers, slow worms, important birds Overdevelopment likely No special circumstance could ever arise that would mean development would be a better option in this instance.</p>	<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.</p>
25205729	Question 8	<p>Based on my own knowledge I have concerns about the following 3 sites: 59661 59701 59834 These sites push the settlement boundary of Tonbridge east into the Swanmead/ Postern Lane area. This area is popular with walkers, runners and cyclists and is a well used recreational area for the town. I also believe the area is subject to extensive flooding and some is designated as Green Belt. The residents of Postern Lane commissioned a report on site 59701 as part of the last Local Plan process. We therefore have more specific details about that site which I will submit as a comment to the Sustainability Report - Annex 1.</p>	<p>The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Open Space Study and SFRA.</p>
45672353	Question 8	<p>Basically the list of positive and negative features depend on who produces them. Borough Green Garden City site No. 59830 is not going to acheive its objectives.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42192673	Question 8	<p>Because does not make rail and public transport central</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
25407841	Question 8	<p>Because I haven't navigated there yet and there is no hyper link to its location. I may come back and rewrite this answer.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
42583457	Question 8	<p>Because the sustainability will not be met</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
25390689	Question 8	<p>Borough Green Garden City - loss of Green Belt and AONB are not acceptable in terms of Climate Change and Natural Environment. Evidence from Bird Track, ID Butterflies, Kent Reptile and Amphibian Group and Medway Biological Records.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42719809	Question 8	<p>Borough Green Garden City is wrongly described as a single site, when in reality it covers multiple sites, each of which has different access to infrastructure.</p> <p>However, the principle of using the brown-field quarries is sensible if the required transport and other infrastructure is built first.</p> <p>The individual sites around Wrotham do not make sense, as there is only basic road infrastructure within Wrotham, in particular the sites on the other side of the village from the M2/M20 link. Additionally, there is only limited community infrastructure within Wrotham, so any new housing is likely to put pressure on transport infrastructure as people need to access schools/shops etc in other villages such as Borough Green.</p>	The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.
42747041	Question 8	<p>Broadly agree with most of the assessments.</p> <p>Collectively, if ALL were developed, the impact on the local area would not all be positive with green space severely diminished, and the density of population putting pressure on local travel and amenities.</p>	Comments noted.
42718497	Question 8	<p>Building on St MARTINS Square 59457 is ludicrous. Where will people park to visit shops.</p> <p>Its a 1043 page report how can we plough through all of it.</p> <p>59460 - Disagree with building next to Cobdown - reduces green space.</p> <p>59464 - The current infrastructure in Teapot Lane cannot cope - why build more houses.</p> <p>59469 Holt Wood. is a green space and must not be developed. There is not enough access. Refuse.</p> <p>59852 - Too much development by Barming station already - refuse this.</p> <p>59861 - This is a green belt area behind Priory Park and should not be developed.</p> <p>59870 - Kiln Barn Road - Again green belt area should not be developed.</p> <p>59873 - Kiln Barn Road - - Not enough traffic infrastructure.</p> <p>59715 Hill Top Farm - Green belt and no access to roads. Refuse.</p> <p>59718 - Larkfield FC - this is a sports ground - refuse.</p> <p>57980 London Road - increased traffic - refuse</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.
42635873	Question 8	<p>Call for land 59745 is of particular interest to me as I live in Oaklands Way and that site sits directly behind my house. I was under the impression that there was a restricted covenant on the land but there are constant requests for planning on that site. I strongly object to the development of that land along with numerous other identified sites in the Hildenborough area. Our infrastructure is already creaking at the seams and the Fidelity site is already being developed putting further pressure on the road infrastructure, the medical services and schools. We simply can't take any more housing here. I'm obviously also concerned with the privacy access as the site is on a slope so any building would directly affect our privacy at the back.</p> <p>The removal of trees that were supposedly dangerous on the land have already caused flooding issues to the bungalows at the end of the cul de sac in Oaklands Way, and above all it's another big green space of working arable land that would be destroyed.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
25063521	Question 8	Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25053249	Question 8	Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
45859137	Question 8	Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
45877569	Question 8	Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
45879009	Question 8	Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
25408289	Question 8	Cannot make any sense of it STRATEGIC MATTERS (1)	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
45369953	Question 8	Cannot make any sense of it.	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42476673	Question 8	<p>Canon Lane Site 59800</p> <p>Canon Lane is an historical, and in most parts, single track lane rising approximately 60 metres to the north where it terminates against narrow woodland and the housing boundaries of Kings Hill. It is bounded in its lower half by extensive traditional stone walls on either side of the narrow lane which date back several hundred years. Its junction with the Tonbridge Road provides limited visibility and has, we understand, seen fatalities.</p> <p>The lane is popular with walkers and cyclists from Kings Hill and the surrounding area, meeting footpaths to both the East and the West at its higher level and providing at the northern end pedestrian access to Kings Hill.</p> <p>Amenity. The site adjoins the north-western part of Canon Lane and comprises land forming part of the Kings Hill golf course, an important sports amenity for the existing Kings Hill Estate and local area.</p> <p>Access. Canon Lane is not capable of providing safe access to any further housing developments along its length. As noted above, it is single lane in the most part, heavily frequented by walkers and cyclists, including unaccompanied school children, and has a dangerous exit on to the Tonbridge Road.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how access to this proposed site can be achieved without obtaining additional rights of way from Kings Hill by demolishing houses on that estate to establish a roadway. Canon Lane itself is entirely unsuitable for higher volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Water table. During the summer of 2022 the small lake shown on the site plan drained, caused, we understand, by a sinkhole which had opened up. This has affected the water table flowing down parts of the hill side leaving empty a further large pond downstream in the water infrastructure which had existed for over a hundred years or more. Subject to expert advice, any further housing developments on the higher reaches of the lane (either this site or site 59802 to the east) could have further effects on the natural flows of water with potential adverse consequences.</p> <p>Site 59802</p> <p>Amenity values and landscape of character. Site 59802 comprises well managed vineyards and, until recently, productive agricultural fields which have been set aside for reasons which are unclear.</p> <p>To the north it bounds and provides footpath access to Cattering Woods which we understand are a protected area. To the south it has exceptional views across miles of beautiful countryside, woodlands and hills providing a landscape of great character. These views would also be significantly damaged by development of the possible sites in the area of Pizien Well on the opposite side of the valley.</p> <p>The footpaths that cross the proposed site provide attractive walking routes to the north, east and south and are heavily frequented particularly by residents of Kings Hill. If these footpaths are eliminated with new build, the recreational walking areas available to these residents in this local area will be constrained largely to a single narrow footpath around the perimeter of the golf course to the west. The farmland comprising this site provides an important amenity for the encouragement of mental well -being and exercise, and access to the natural environment with its wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>With climate change, the well managed recent development of vineyards on this site has provided an attractive alternative use of the farmland bringing sustainable employment opportunities. Vineyards provide an important agricultural evolution for the region with a growing economic contribution to the County, including local tourism, and should be encouraged.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Open Space Study and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>The loss of such an outstanding site to the community, to the local character of this part of the Kentish countryside, and the growing evolution of its agricultural contribution and example, would have significant impact.</p> <p>This land should be protected as one of the treasures of the area.</p> <p>Access. Canon Lane does not offer a safe or appropriate access. In addition it is not clear how access from the east can be secured without cutting through Cattering Woods which are protected as ancient woodland and should be left unharmed.</p> <p>Water. The comments above apply so far as they concern the water availability, water table and possible pollution.</p> <p>3. Pizien Well area. Sites 59799,59624, and 59723.</p> <p>The fields and woods comprising the Pizien Well area provide an attractive country setting of historical note. Its few houses are well tended and in the lower parts form a beautiful settlement of cottages around the waterways. The original medieval village which gave rise to the development of Watringbury is believed to have existed here and its original market was established here in the 14th Century. Foundations of previous dwellings still exist in the woodlands. The few houses in Pizien Well are served by single track lanes.</p> <p>(i) Amenity and the character of the landscape. The Pizien Well area, including Site 50624, contains numerous heavily used, popular footpaths serving communities in Watringbury, Pizien Well and Nettlestead.</p> <p>Site 59624, which is situated on high land, comprises valuable and productive farmlands with exceptional views to the north and east, and having important footpaths to the east , west, north, and south. It forms the character of this landscape which would be destroyed by development and blight the excellent southerly views from the land on the opposite side of the valley near Kings Hill on and around Site 59802.</p> <p>Site 59799 would result in the destruction of the attractive and well-tended setting containing the existing cottages comprising Pizien Well Lane.</p> <p>Any development in this area would destroy the character of this beautiful landscape, eliminate valuable, productive agricultural land and access to this natural environment for the health and well-being of the community, and would have a heavy impact on biodiversity and animal life.</p>	
25100225	Question 8	can't understand it	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42657601	Question 8	<p>Commenting on Site 59811</p> <p>1]The site is not near any existing play area or sports facility. The nearest Doctors Surgery is in Hadlow. That is several miles from the closest point of the development to Hadlow.</p> <p>2] As observed the proposed site has no accessibility. The area is surrounded by three narrow lanes with no verges, street lights or bus services. The traffic is currently too busy and too fast for the size of the roads.</p> <p>3]There are 3 modest size primary schools nearby. The closest is about 4km. away from the site. Again, the roads are inadequate to deal with increased traffic and there are no bises as previously mentioned. The lanes are too narrow to safely accommodate buses and in winter too dark and dangerous for drop off etc. The secondary schools are much further away and again spaces, transport links and safety should be major red flags.</p> <p>4]Agree, it will not</p> <p>5] Some of this statement is true, it is an area of designated biodiversity and green belt. There is an array of wildlife that resides in and lives in this food-providing part of the Borough. As well as fields there are ancient hedgerows and woodlands on this site.</p> <p>6]It would indeed result in the loss, forever of a designated open space.</p> <p>7] Why designate an asset as a Heritage asset and then build all around it.</p> <p>10] Partly agree although I would say it is a major negative</p> <p>14] The document states 100 dwellings or more. The site plan suggests 2000+. The Parish of West Peckham is very small and very rural. Its identity would be lost by even a small settlement being developed.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.</p>
42331649	Question 8	<p>Commenting only in the sites in the Ightham area, the majority are green belt and should not proceed. Others are surrounded by green belt which also makes development unwelcome.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42653057	Question 8	<p>Commenting only on the sites I am familiar with:-</p> <p>59877 - Destroys existing public open space to the detriment of quality of life.</p> <p>59881 - Significant urban sprawl to North of villiage, not sustainable for services.</p> <p>59489 - Destroys existing public open space causing massive increase to noise, light and air pollution for residents, not to mention already major lack of parking. Waste water and utility upgrades also required.</p> <p>59712 - Refer 59881</p> <p>59709 - Significant urban sprawl to West of village, destroying natural grassland separation from Ightam</p> <p>59720 - Refer 59709</p> <p>59830 - This proposal will totally destroy the entire nature of our village and surrounding areas. It would effectively create a large town with all the urban pressure on traffic, parking, services, utilities, rail services etc. etc. I can foresee no mitigation plan for these problems, just massive increases in pollution and gridlock. It would also require the redesignation of greenbelt land which is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
45099489	Question 8	<p>Comments on the Shipbourne potential sites 59779, 59827, 59825</p> <p>Overall we are concerned about the scale of the proposals (both in total and per site) and how they would impact on the character and landscape of this beautiful village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The village is within the Green Belt and AONB and has Conservation Areas. • Potential total of more than 120 dwellings plus other mixed use is disproportionate to a village of around 200 dwellings. • Any future development should take on board the village design statement and be sensitive to the way the village has grown as a patchwork of small, low density, piecemeal additions over time. • Part of the beauty of the village lies in the open sight lines of countryside • Shipbourne is an amenity destination, a focal point for walkers and cyclists. This increased markedly during covid and has continued showing how much it is valued as a resource for access to the countryside. • An increase in traffic on the narrow rural roads through the village would be a problem, for walkers and cyclists as well as residents. • Lots of new housing would generate light and noise pollution to the detriment of the rural character of the village. 	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.</p>
45469601	Question 8	<p>Comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grane Farm and the Green trees 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42722209	Question 8	<p>Developments along the A26 from Maidstone through to Tonbridge Wells including: 59597, 59624, 59655, 59624, 59664, 59726, 59728, 59799, 59803, 59806, 59845, 59599, 59729, 59742, 59805, 59816 all suffer with major access issues. The A26 is already close to capacity and links with other main route such as the A20 and M20 are poor. Hermitage lane runs past the Maidstone Hospital and will require a major development to ensure access to the hospital is not compromised. Seven Mile lane already suffers with significant heavy transport between the motorway system and Paddock Wood and is a regular accident blackspot. The cross roads in Watlingbury is already over capacity and causes significant delays at peak times. Developments to the south of Kils Hill and to to the east including: 59424, 59544, 59861 impact upon significant green spaces and begin to merge the Kings Hill development with Watlingbury Barming and other villages fundamentally changing the character of the area in a detrimental way. Similarly 59740 then also merges Kings Hill with West Malling , East Malling Larkfield and Leybourne also making a significant impact on the character of the area, In addition the development 59597 near Yotes Court is not a Brownfield site and contains a significant area of agricultural land. Development 59816 cannot be considered as fair access band. Other developments nearby effectively accessing the same roads and junctions such as the cross roads between Mereworth road and seven nile Lane are consider poor. This development also fundamentally changes the nature of Mereworth and the surrounding villages Development. Application 59749 and 59750 will have a huge impact on the ares around Mereworth. The infrastructure is at breaking point with the West Malling road and Seven mile lane requiring major development to enable them to carry the additional capacity with any degree of safety.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.</p>
42674753	Question 8	<p>Disagree with the need to build on sites which have direct access to already congested main roads and areas where there are children attending schools.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42514209	Question 8	<p>Do not feel qualified to answer</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25045889	Question 8	Do not understand it.	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
42493185	Question 8	<p>Each individual site needs to be responded to directly with detailed point made on local knowledge and evidence. These may include some of the following :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All sites along the A26 will generate more traffic through the village and should not be considered before any sites closer to stations or Motorway junctions or in the established urban centres. 2. Particular sites requiring access along narrow country lanes or using tight junctions with limited visibility will cause unreasonably dangerous increases to traffic flows and endanger pedestrians and other road users. 3. The flood risk from flooding and run off should rule out some proposed sites, in particular to those in the flood plain of the River Bourne. I attach a copy of the flood risk maps with the proposal locations overlaid. 4. The new developments should be an integral part of the existing settlement to be sustainable. so isolated sites not connected directly to the established built up area should not be suitable. 5. If they are currently undeveloped they may be removing high grade agricultural land use and reducing the agricultural character of the area, impacting our food security. I attach a copy of the agricultural land assessment with the development sites overlaid. 6. Heritage assets, listed buildings and registered parks and monuments have protection which goes beyond the immediate curtilage to include the setting. If new development damages the setting of the listed building or park, for example by changing an isolated rural location into a housing estate, then it should be turned down. In the case of Hadlow Tower or Oxenhoath, part of the character and setting are the key long views which would be damaged by many of the proposed developments. I attach an overlay of the Historic England map of registered protected Heritage sites. 7. Hadlow is identified as a local service centre, but in truth many of these services are limited and currently over subscribed. Please can people come forward with specific facts with regards to Health and Education availability or restrictions. 8. If you feel a proposed site in another area has more potential or makes better use of underutilized land, please comment and make a case for development of these if you feel they are more suitable. 9. The ecological value of sites is also very important and some creatures have statutory protection to their habitats including Bats, Great Crested Newts, Dormice, Water voles, Turtle Doves, Badgers, & otters. If you have any sightings of any of these on particular sites it is important to raise the matter of biodiversity. 10. Trees, woodlands and hedgerows are all vital to combat global warming and need to be given greater protection in the local plan with presumptions to retain. Woodland sites should in particular not be developed. New developments need to result in a net increase in tree cover, not a loss of canopy. <p>Site Specific :- 59638 NO - Prone to flooding/ damage to setting of a listed building and tree lined avenue (TPO ?) and question safe access.Green belt and loss of agricultural land. 59637 NO - Extends settlement into Green Belt and tight narrow access from Cemetery Lane onto A26.Potential to flood. Next to Hadlow Cemetery with monument/history etc. Green belt / agricultural land loss. 59686. NO - No highway access so relies on other sites to link into. ie 59637 and 59647 which together will all add congestion & pollution .</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastucture Delivery Plan, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Open Space Study.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		59646. NO - Court Lane congestion plus major access problem onto A26 from Court Lane. Impact of loss of Green Belt & loss of agricultural land.	
42690369	Question 8	<p>East Malling and the surrounding areas have a lot of character and beauty. Character and beauty that existing residents and visitors savour. Allowing any of the proposed sites to be developed for housing will significantly impact this and once an undeveloped site or green space is built on, it will be lost forever.</p> <p>I live in East Malling. In terms of infrastructure, particularly the roads, there is absolutely no capacity for any more cars and people as traffic is already problematic and essential services at breaking point. This applies to all towns and villages in the area and the south-east, not just locally. Allowing such developments will fill in the attractive and necessary green spaces between villages and towns and, in some cases, destroy increasingly crucial agricultural land.</p> <p>It is essential the proposed sites and all other open spaces remain undeveloped and I raise my objection to the proposed listings in the strongest possible sense. I object to the following sites being included in the Local Plan.:</p> <p>59448</p> <p>59449</p> <p>59450</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		50630	
		59631	
		59636	
		59673	
		59698	
		59715	
		59726	
		59740	
		59743	
		59824	
		59391	
		59393	
		59397	
		59398	
		59469	
		59460	
		59464	
		59472	
		59668	
		59694	
		59713	
		59738	
		59772	
		59780	
		59781	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		59839	
		59852	
		59856	
		59861	
		59867	
		59868	
		59870	
		59873	
		59433	
		59436	
		59437	
		59438	
		59457	
		59494	
		59718	
		59432	
		59441	
		59442	
		59443	
		59445	
		59447	
		59456	
		59488	
		59594	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		59602	
		59603	
		59619	
		59620	
		59621	
		59622	
		59645	
		59658	
		59672	
		59699	
		59714	
		59716	
		59733	
		59756	
		59762	
		59807	
		59814	
		59833	
		59844	
		59854	
		59860	
		59863	
		59634	
		59655	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42824705	Question 8	<p>For the all sites in the East Peckham (TN12) area which lie within the floodplain (flood zones 2, 3 and 3b) it is essential to note and properly assess the risks that any development would exacerbate the flooding in downstream communities within the Medway Valley.</p> <p>This applies to the following sites: 59613, 59837, 59876, 59616, 59782, 59650, 59855, 59742, 59682, 59789, 59646</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
38330913	Question 8	Full consultation responses have been submitted in relation to all sites identified in the isa and linked to E Peckham.	Comments noted.
42444353	Question 8	Further development of site will increase traffic even more and there are no incentives to use public transport. Rural villages are not served by mainland stations so even more congestion will occur from commuters reaching train stations. Traffic along the A26 hadlow > tonbridge is incredibly busy at peak times and this will get worse. The development will also lead to a loss of biodiversity and remove the semi rural nature of the local area. There is no easy access to shops, schools, medical facilities from these new developments.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42804705	Question 8	General development in stock greens area is likely to substantially increase existing flood risk to Brookmead estate & surrounding areas sites 227,237,402,421	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42646849	Question 8	Generally Although the maps did not zoom in so I can't be sure about my specific area.	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42543553	Question 8	<p>Green trees & Grange Farm 59685</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and Open Space Study.</p>
42441153	Question 8	have you any idea how tricky it is to navigate this?	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
42795041	Question 8	Haven't had opportunity to read this (working parent) but I hope this does not exclude my opinions from being heard.	Comments noted.
42429089	Question 8	How do you expect laymen to answer these questions?	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772033	Question 8	I agree with most of the findings of the following 14 sites in Watlington: 59700 59845 59624 59723 59799 59797 59664 59728 59729 59654 59803 59800 59802 59722. However, please note my comments in section 4.3 of this consultation as I have expressed my thoughts and concerns regarding these particular sites.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722881	Question 8	<p>I agree with the the Sustainability Appraisal Report where it correctly identifies 4 out 23 Hildenborough sites as being less sustainable, namely 59669, 59783, 59798 and 59801.</p> <p>Site 59745 is clearly developable as are the nearby sites of 59823, 59801, 59609, 59625, 59835, and 59804 as they are beside other built up areas and will not affect the flooding issues in Hildenborough</p> <p>Site 59679 should clearly not be developed. A planning application was recently submitted for this site and was not recommended for development by the planning officer. The comments on this site were as follows: The Local Planning Authority acknowledge that the contribution of 76no. dwellings would contribute to housing supply within the Borough, which currently stands at 3.17 years. The conclusions reached regarding level of harm and the heritage balance as required by paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) are disagreed with. The heritage benefits proposed, including the repairs to the building and landscaping improvements, would not greatly mitigate the harm caused by the combined impact of the new school buildings and whilst they are significant, they are not reliant on this scheme. It is concluded that there are no public benefits arising from the proposed scheme in the context of paragraph 202 of NPPF, which would outweigh heritage harm as set out.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42585729	Question 8	<p>I agreed with most of the findings of the following 14 sites in Watlington:</p> <p>59700 59845 59624 59723 59799 59797 59664 59728 59729 59654 59803 59800 59802 59722</p> <p>However, please note my comments in section 4.3 of this consultation as I have expressed my thoughts and concerns regarding these particular sites.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42768321	Question 8	I am against all plans for change!	Comments noted.
42544705	Question 8	I am not an expert and I do not wish to comment on whether or not the findings are correct however what I cannot understand is why Eccles is being allocated such a large amount of development which is not proportionate with other areas. It has terrible transport links, a railway station which is not accessible easily by bus. It is a good half an hour walk away. The bus service was nearly stopped this year and is a very limited service. We have no medical services nearby, the medical centre will move to Wouldham, which will not be sufficient to cover so many surrounding villages,	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42780449	Question 8	I am not in a position to support challenges technically as I sadly don't have the time, but the basic technical issues with various areas are as follows: - Unless you can ask the rain to manage itself across the year, keep off flood plains unless you're going to be rebuilding wetlands. This I specifically know to be of concern in the area behind Cannon Lane and Hadlow Road and at Tonbridge Farm area - infrastructure doesn't seem to be sufficiently considered (NE Tonbridge area mentioned above and Southwest Tonbridge especially) - Development between Hildenborough and Shipbourne road seems ecologically least damaging, but again infrastructure requires significant alteration to prevent traffic bottlenecks and damage to air quality	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.
38372161	Question 8	I am not in favour of the vast majority of sites nominated in the call for sites. Again, are there any brown field locations that can be used?	Comments noted.
42614849	Question 8	I am not well informed enough to make a judgement	Comments noted.
38606561	Question 8	I am opposed to further development in these areas	Comments noted.
42589281	Question 8	I am particularly concerned about Grange Farm and the Greentrees sites which are part of the Green Belt. This is high quality agricultural land which will be more valuable as such than as development sites. Also, this area is already very congested with traffic - any more will make life unbearable. Additionally the local schools, GP surgeries and dentists are already over-stretched.	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.
42544513	Question 8	I am totally not in favour of the majority of sites nominated in Call for Sites. Why do all these sites have to be on green belt land? The Golf Course!!!???	Comments noted.
42557441	Question 8	I cannot answer this question, there is too much material to assess and it has not been well organised. It would have been easier to have some form of numerical score, so sites could be ranked and sites should be organised by area, with a key map showing where the areas are located in the borough.	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to respond to these in future iterations.
42471041	Question 8	I cannot find appendix D. I am disappointed to not be able to give specific feedback on areas.	Comments noted.
42781825	Question 8	I disagree with site reference 59688. The area is prone to flooding.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42716321	Question 8	I disagree with the sites that fall under options 3, 4 and 5 above.	Comments noted.
42830913	Question 8	I do not agree that there should be any further building in the borough, particularly near Kings Hill and West/ East Malling. These areas are already overcrowded, polluted and rubbish strewn. The character of the area is being ruined.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
25384001	Question 8	<p>I do not agree with the methodology used by this study. For example the Borough Green Gardens site is treated as a single unit spatially. In reality it is 5 different quarries all at different stages of quarrying. There is no point in ticking a box twice because part of the site is close to a station if the other end of the site is miles away. There is no point on ticking a box because there is a local school when it is obvious that an extra 3,000 families will need multiple new school forms and huge infrastructure that's currently not present.</p> <p>It would be far better to make a serious attempt to quantify the infrastructure required, including an end to end 'Relief Road', and estimating costs it in order to determine if the proposal is even viable.</p> <p>Can a road be built in time given that the quarries keep extending their time horizon to complete quarrying?</p>	The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.
42378241	Question 8	<p>I do not agree with the methodology used by this study. For example the Borough Green Gardens site is treated as a single unit spatially. In reality it is 5 different quarries all at different stages of quarrying. There is no point in ticking a box twice because part of the site is close to a station if the other end of the site is miles away. There is no point on ticking a box because there is a local school when it is obvious that an extra 3,000 families will need multiple new school forms and huge infrastructure that's currently not present.</p> <p>It would be far better to make a serious attempt to quantify the infrastructure required, including an end to end 'Relief Road', and estimating costs it in order to determine if the proposal is even viable.</p> <p>Can a road be built in time given that the quarries keep extending their time horizon to complete quarrying</p>	The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.
25408097	Question 8	<p>I do not agree with the methodology used by this study. For example the Borough Green Gardens site is treated as a single unit spatially. In reality it is 5 different quarries all at different stages of quarrying. There is no point in ticking a box twice because part of the site is close to a station if the other end of the site is miles away. There is no point in ticking a box because there is a local school when it is obvious that an extra 3,000 families will need multiple new school forms and huge infrastructure that's currently not present.</p> <p>It would be far better to make a serious attempt to quantify the infrastructure required, including an end to end 'Relief Road', and estimating costs it in order to determine if the proposal is even viable.</p> <p>Can a road be built in time given that the quarries keep extending their time horizon to complete quarrying?</p>	The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.
44972961	Question 8	<p>I do not agree with the methodology used by this study. For example, the Borough Green Gardens site is treated as a single unit spatially. In reality it is 5 different quarries all at different stages of quarrying. There is no point in ticking a box twice because part of the site is close to a station if the other end of the site is miles away. There is no point on ticking a box because there is a local school when it is obvious that an extra 3,000 families will need multiple new school forms and huge infrastructure that's currently not present.</p> <p>It would be far better to make a serious attempt to quantify the infrastructure required, including an end to end 'Relief Road', and estimating costs it in order to determine if the proposal is even viable.</p> <p>Can a road be built in time given that the quarries keep extending their time horizon to complete quarrying?</p>	The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.
42770017	Question 8	<p>I do not agree with the methodology used in this study . Eg the Borough Green Garden site which is a huge are is treated as one are and what may be appropriate for one end is not for the other. Ticking a box for a primary school is inappropriate when 3000 house will require provision of a further school, GP surgeries new roads etc.</p>	The site was submitted as one site. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42687745	Question 8	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense at all.	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
45859969	Question 8	I do not agree with the sustainability report. Most of it makes no sense at all.	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
45174209	Question 8	<p>I do not agree. I wish to register my concern for the inclusion of Site 59470 Broadwater Farm & the findings of its Individual Site Assessment. The reasons for my concern are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of serious harm to many heritage assets. The proposal of this site would necessitate the tragic loss of a beautiful Conservation Area which we have a duty to protect for our children and generations to come. This development impacts on the local heritage of the area including the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation Area and the Well Street Conservation Area. They are included in one Conservation Area delegation recognised by Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council (TMBC) in 1993, which notes the strong visual links between the historic buildings of New Barns and Broadwater Farm. It is this visual link which the Conservation Order is protecting. The Conservation Order notes the distinctively Kentish view from either end of the bridal pass as it connects between Lavenders Road and Broadwater Road. This site would do irrevocable damage and would contravene the Conservation Order which is set to protect such areas and steward their safety for generations to come. • This site would lead to the inevitable coalescence of East Malling, West Malling, Kings Hill and nearby Hamlets. Which is directly at odds with the stated aims of the Local Plan. • This site would lead to the loss of high grade farm land • This site would cause harm to the aquifer and represents a serious and reckless lack of consideration of hydrogeology issues which could result in degradation of soil and potential flooding risk. • Lavenders Road (our road), Well Street and Pikey lane are all designated 'Quiet Lanes'. All roads would be severely impacted by Site 59740. They have double bends, stone walls, conservation area status and listed buildings. They are totally unsuitable for the additional traffic that will be inevitable as traffic is unlikely to be stopped by the proposed examples to restrict vehicular access to rural lines from the site as scooters, dirt bikes and drivers who are aware of the road system will simply ignore all signage. This is the case with drivers who currently cut through from Swan Street to the A228 via the train station approach road. This increased traffic will result in serious damage to historic verges, hedgerows and walls, as well as inevitable injuries and deaths to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders due to the lack of pavements (and no space to add any). <p>The proposal infringes on this network in ways that are not only damaging to this heritage but clearly extremely dangerous. Lavenders Road in particular is a narrow and dangerous bend for unfamiliar drivers. We have only lived here for three years and there have been three major incidents in that period including 29 Nov 2019 –a collision between a scooter and van knocked down the bollards that protect our house from the road. Again, in 8 February 2021 when a van skidded on the corner and crashed into the bollards, again knocking them down and August 2022 when a car sped around the corner, colliding with the bollards and with our property. These incidents were all logged with Kent Highways who repaired the bollards extremely quickly due to their importance to safety. There are underlying safety concerns on this particularly blind corner and any increase in usage would be extremely dangerous.</p> <p>The historical sunken paths are interlaced with pathways which are vital spaces for both locals and visitors. This is a Conservation Area for a reason. Cutting across this network with new roads and increasing the traffic on the QL</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. Evidence will also be prepared including a Stategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>network with an additional 900 homes would be absolutely catastrophic for the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very importantly, this site would place critical stress on existing road, medical & other infrastructure which are already at breaking point. This proposal includes a medical facility building but with no guarantee that it will be occupied. Locally, we are aware that a nearby development has failed over a period of many years to tempt GPs and other health services to take on a similar centre. In fact there is an existing medical centre (Leybourne Grange) which was built for a new development on the other side of West Malling which has NEVER been used due to the difficulty in opening and staffing a new service. Realistically, much like Leybourne Grande, these 900 new homes would be serviced by West Malling Group Practice which is already overwhelmed by demand. The Group Practice has registered their objections to BH's application on these grounds 	
42224609	Question 8	I don't have time to read them all. Sorry	Comments noted
42794529	Question 8	I don't understand it	Comments noted
42684641	Question 8	<p>I have answeredon some sites showing my answers . I do not have time to go through each one . I will say with this number of houses water will be an issue especially by 2040 and I don't think this is taken seriously enough.</p> <p>59637 Outskirts of Hadlow. Flood Zone 3 sump area for water. No rail service not a great bus service. Tight road access to the A26 which will be packed with cars . Not one of the brightest ideas.</p> <p>59691 Wedged between J4 and another round surrounded by water in zone 3. I would not want any child breathing in air form these potential houses.</p> <p>59669 Near Hildenborough Rail sation. great site careful build as prone to flooding? on a slope? This would help with co2 levels as no need to drive to the station!</p> <p>59763 This is part of a whole site near Eccles. I still think building here would be really interesting as the water features around here would be fabulous. Expensive build as all houses would need to be raised .</p> <p>59783 The other side of the road to the station- a bit further away. Greenbelt and not a great shaped plot. 59669 a much better site in Hlldenborough.</p> <p>59799 Is this near a heritage site? Over a stream are you planning watermills? Think again I would suggest.</p> <p>59800 and 59802 both extensions to Kings Hill so not a bad idea locations not ideal but plant lots of trees. It could be a lovely site.</p> <p>59806 a site between Hadlow and Mereworth Spread across the a228 High Flood risk and along with 50811 and 59637 you have just build on good farmland and built the 9000 homes. All cars would have to drive to a rail station A26 is the only major road and the congestion would be a nightmare. This is prime farming land and to buildings here would be an eyesore for miles around- especially the Oxenhoath site. NO NO NO</p> <p>59818 Burham what a delightful Kent Village- the most glorious views and you want to build how many home near the river? On aesthetic grounds . No and nowhere near a rail station and bus route .Car or water transport only then. No</p> <p>59827 this site is not near any amenities, could flood and is in a sleepy kent village NO. There were s couple of sites in Plaxtol which would be infill and this village has a post office . Relook at these if you want to build around this area. They would no flood either.</p>	<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. Evidence will also be prepared including a Stategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>59839 Near Barming rail station and a good site.</p> <p>59749 The northern part of this plot would flood probably as Flood zone 3/1. This is still well away from a rail station on green belt land and agricultural land. The use of cars on this site would be the way to go and I think is a poor choice.</p> <p>TMBC have in the above choices chosen to build mainly on greenfield sites north of Hadlow with poor access to rail services and a mediocre bus service. Cars would be the transport of choice. The main A26 is accessible for this volume of Traffic through Hadlow Village – where you are also planning to build a large no of homes on flooded fields, which form a sump for the area around.</p> <p>These choices are very poor indeed. It is imperative that homes are build near good transport links and that means a good rail service. There are at least four excellent rails links in this borough. You will not be able to achieve car usage reduction if you continue with these sites. All councils keep hammering about bike usage. I am a fit 62 year old and I would not ride a bike to my local co-op in Martin Hardie way as Cuckoo Lane is too dangerous. So if I am not a user this is NOT a good omen. People take the easy route -if it is cheaper and faster (as you don't park a car) to walk to a rail station or have a very frequent bus route- people will use that option. So concentrate your plans on areas with rail services. This is the main reason why people move here quick access to London.</p> <p>The above choices are NOT sound and will only cause more road usage.</p> <p>59796 the Lidl site good as you just roll out of bed to the station.</p> <p>59878/9 the station car park great position but people need to park so build a multi storey on the other car park site.</p> <p>59815 really stocks green?</p>	
42732801	Question 8	I have commented on this along side Annex 1 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report previously.	Comments noted.
42716353	Question 8	I have no idea what this question means	Comments noted.
42325153	Question 8	<p>I have not studied each and everyone of the 290 sites identified in the call for sites.</p> <p>However the criteria for assessment appear to be sensible and reasonable.</p> <p>Supported by necessary improvements in infrastructure, new waste water treatment, new potable water supply, additional electricity generation and distribution, additional communications and telecom networks, improved gas supplies, as well as local highway improvements, and restructured bus services to provide communication and connectivity between villages and towns.</p>	Support for criteria noted. development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42775841	Question 8	<p>I have reviewed the Local Plan as it affects Shipbourne namely site IDs 59779, 59827 and 59825. I do support the issues raised by the Parish Council and I will comment and/or endorse them individually below.</p> <p>I would however, first make a more general point about the effect that any one of the proposals would have if they proceeded. Shipbourne is a small village in and surrounded by the green belt and areas of natural beauty. On most weekend days the village green is teeming with people who walk with children and pets, cycle, picnic and generally enjoy open air ambience of one of the very few villages that have the natural vista and area to accommodate such a wide range of activities.</p> <p>The infrastructure has evolved to support the open structure and tiny population of the village and would require significant investment to usefully accommodate the additional housing detailed in the .</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the village houses have to rely on septic systems as a mains sewage connection inaccessible. • There is no mains gas available. Home heating is usually tanker delivered gas or oil. • The primary school is tiny and already oversubscribed. There is little room for physical expansion. It sits immediately beside a main, straight road that has never had a speed limit respected by the majority of drivers. • The water supply comes from a very small reservoir and although the supply has never ceased altogether there have been instances of very low water pressure. <p>Building out even the smallest of the items (59779) would overburden the existing infrastructure but would not justify the expenditure required bring it up to modern day standards.</p> <p>In other words it would destroy one of the most picturesque villages in Kent and transform it into a rather mediocre small town.</p>	<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.</p>
42587521	Question 8	I have yet to meet anyone who thinks the proposed changes are acceptable and realise this is an exercise being completed at the behest of central government	Comment noted.
42799649	Question 8	I haven't read Annex 1 yet. If I am looking at the correct document it seems to be in excess of 1000 pages. I'm very sorry but I won't have time in the next 24 hours to read that.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441857	Question 8	<p>I object to any development on the following sites in the SAR: 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809</p> <p>I object to development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. Evidence will also be prepared including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42776929	Question 8	<p>I object to development at the following sites. 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809. They were not included in the previous Development Plan as they fulfilled all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF, i.e. a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The MAFF survey of April 1991 carried out by TMBC classified these sites as productive and Best Most Valuable Agricultural Land [Grades 1,2,3A]. Shortages caused by the Ukraine War highlights their importance.</p> <p>As well as these sites being prone to flooding to a saturation level, I am extremely worried about further congestion especially at peak times on the A26 leading to Tonbridge and other local roads. TWBC's proposed developments in Tudeley and Paddock Wood will lead to cut-through traffic on roads including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>Any development here will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity and irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low density character of North Tonbridge.</p> <p>Health and Education Services are already stretched in Tonbridge and increasing the population will seriously affect the functioning of the Town Centre in a negative way. These sites are not easily accessible to local amenities, i.e. shops, schools and medical facilities.</p>	<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.</p>
42544385	Question 8	I object to the building of homes on Grange Farm because it is on Green Belt land and should be protected.	Comments noted
42720321	Question 8	I object to thes developments	Comments noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42544417	Question 8	I objecting to building of houses on Grange Farm because this is top quality agriculture land and is green belt land.	Comments noted
42803201	Question 8	<p>I refer to sites: 59624, 59631, 59654, 59664, 59700, 59726, 59728, 59797, 59799, 59803, 59845, 59723, 68729 All sites referred are located in or on the outskirts of Wateringbury and I believe any development of these sites will be detrimental to the people who already live there and the local environment for the following reasons: Wateringbury is a village with around 800 dwellings, any development over just a handful of dwellings will significantly change the identify of the village as a country / rural place. The village is not well served by public transport and the consequent use of the A26 is excessive with queues often stretching back past the church one way and to Teston in the opposite direction. The crossroads is already highly polluted and is currently running at 24% above capacity. Developments in any of the sites above will inevitably increase traffic through the crossroads (or towards East Malling with the inevitable bottle neck by the railway bridge) or via Teston village with its narrow road leading down to the A26. In addition, developments in both Maidstone and Paddock wood also bring additional traffic along the A26 It is also important to note that the village sees on average 1 or 2 blue light ambulances every hour heading between Maidstone and Pembury Hospitals. Bow road is extremely narrow and often single file due to on road parking for houses without driveways. Ambulances are frequently held up trying to get through the village, increasing the traffic due to any expansion in residences in the village will inevitably increase this problem. The GP surgery is already unable to accept any new patients and the village school is not of a sufficient size to accommodate a huge influx of new pupils. Secondary schools are either in Maidstone, Paddock Wood or Tonbridge with no dedicated school buses. The village has just one very small general store forcing people to travel, usually by car, to larger shops several miles away. Wateringbury has always been a rural village and despite the large volume of traffic currently using the roads, it maintains many of the qualities of a village. substantially increasing the size of the village will grid lock roads, increase pollution and destroy what is left of the village identify.</p> <p>I would also refer to sites 59636 and 59740. Both of these sites are currently arable land and it is an absolute travesty to even suggest that this precious green space which is highly fertile and capable of being cultivated to provide much needed local food, should be concreted over. The size of the site is huge and will dwarf existing clusters of homes, turning a rural habitat in to a concrete jungle with zero infrastructure, no public transport links, no shops within walking distance, quiet lanes clogged up with cars, no facilities to deal with sewage, no GP surgeries, already over utilised hospitals. The council should, in my opinion be setting valuable arable land aside as a means to try and ensure reduced food miles feed in to reduction in pollution and sustainability targets</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42641665	Question 8	<p>I refer to the following sites on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees. -59685 -59690 -59693 -59721 -59805 -59809</p> <p>I object to the development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principle reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing traffic congestion on the A26 and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads including Hadlow Rd, Crawford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low density character of North Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to expansion of town boundaries and 	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	
38468641	Question 8	I refuse to agree to reports and appendicies that have been made so complex to understand that you either need to seek professional advice or just blindly agree with teh desired council viewpoint. I can't help feel this document is less a fair consultation but more an exercise in box ticking that will be largely ignored in the decision making process.	Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.
42715905	Question 8	I think that greenfield infill sites within developed areas, whilst they meet an objective in not pushing development to beyond the current boundaries of built up areas. They have a greater detrimental impact on the lives of locals. Sites 59531, 59534, 59544 & 59547 - these are open spaces within the built up area Kings Hill, that are enjoyed by locals for recreational purposes, they give character to the development and a sense of space in what would otherwise by just a mass of houses. The benefit from the small amount of housing that these spaces would provided is dwarfed by the level of amenity that they all ready provide to local residents. I would prefer development on the fringes of Kings Hill than for these treasured spaces to be infilled. I can only speak for my local area but I would assume that many others in other areas would feel the same about greenfield infill spaces. However I would be fully supportive of brownfield infill spaces.	The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastucture Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.
42388225	Question 8	I think the document is ambiguous. It includes enormous sites such as the one at Borough Green which should be a totally seperate issue.	Comments noted
42036865	Question 8	I think you're asking about sites in Appendix B as I can't find any Appendix D. Bourne ward has been assessed for 6000 possible dwellings in a rural, agricultural, green belt area which would be devastating for the villages, the road infrastructure, the ability to produce local food and the environment. If your ambition is to concrete over The Garden of England, this is the way to go.	The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastucture Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.
42443041	Question 8	I will comment in the individual sites form in Appendix B. My main concern is that the appraisal seems to bear very little relation to the reality of the sites and in particular has over-weighted the benefit of there being a bus service within 800m of (a part of?) the site. In reality there is very little possibility of sustainable travel from villages such as Mereworth as there is usually a long walk to the bus stop, the buses don't go to e.g. the supermarket, and they cost a fortune: e.g. £6+ return fare to Tonbridge from Mereworth, children aged 5 or over cost half of this. It cost me £13.50 to travel by bus from Mereworth to Maidstone Hospital nearly 10 years ago, with 2 children; this is totally unaffordable and I have since had to go everywhere by car.	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.
38779009	Question 8	I would like guarantees that amenity land - playgrounds, greens, playing fields - is not designated for housing.	The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastucture Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42149537	Question 8	<p>I would like to make a complaint about the proposed site ID 59494, Larkfield North ME20 6GZ. This is a main green on an estate, any development would negatively affect all the residents of the estate and will have already affected the ability of residents to sell their houses and the value of those houses.</p> <p>The green is maintained by the estate management company Omnicroft at the expense of residents. I would like to challenge the legality of plans for development on this basis and the legality of the identification and publication of this site in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.</p> <p>I would request that this site is removed from the report.</p>	<p>The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.</p>
42662209	Question 8	<p>ID 59623 for [REDACTED]</p> <p>I strongly object to the planning proposal to demolish [REDACTED], 2 Yardley Park Road, Tonbridge, Kent TN9 1NE and replace it with flats. [REDACTED] is in a Conservation Area which should live up to its name and preserve old buildings. [REDACTED] is over 110 years old, being built before 1911 (as proved by the Census) and it is one of the oldest houses in Yardley Park Road. This lovely Edwardian home has an attractive frontage (at the side of the house, since it originally had a circular driveway where 2a now stands) and a delightful conservatory backing onto the lawn. The side of the house faces Yardley Park Road and it was surrounded by many mature trees and a pond until 2009 when the new owners cut down many of these trees and removed the pond.</p> <p>The house inside is also delightful. The ground floor had a thick wooden parquet floor and grand wooden staircase. After entering the front door and lobby there is an unusual wooden and glass double door entrance into the large hall. The large hall has beams on the ceiling with a sweeping staircase. There is a large, elegant drawing room. The spacious dining room has French windows opening onto the lawn via the conservatory. The breakfast room leads to the kitchen, which has a connecting pantry. Another historic feature is the working push-button bell system in many rooms. The Edwardian bell-pull by the front door also still worked in 2009. Upstairs there were 3 very spacious light bedrooms (2 still having their original basins) and also a small Dressing Room (I believe that the Dressing Room has been converted into another bathroom). The top floor has 2 attic bedrooms.</p> <p>My late parents lived at [REDACTED] from 1973 until they died in 2007 and they loved this house and I know the property very well. We did not sell their home to 3 developers and instead we sold it to a family to preserve the house, who have renovated it in recent years so why knock it down now? What a waste. It would be environmentally disadvantageous to demolish a recently renovated house, wasting natural resources.</p> <p>A local historian told us that the bomb shelter should also be preserved and that few of this type still exist.</p> <p>The garden was a haven for birds, foxes and even a pine marten and it was secluded and surrounded by trees, some of which are still standing. The garden used to include a lawn tennis court that was used by top Wimbledon tennis players in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Previous neighbours at 2a and 4 Yardley Park Road both talked about it in 1973. [REDACTED] has a lovely garden that should not be destroyed.</p> <p>The extra traffic caused by so many new flats could potentially be dangerous by the roundabout, the narrow Shipbourne Road and the local shop. My father never used the Shipbourne Road entrance due to these safety issues for pedestrians and vehicles. He found the traffic congestion around their home difficult, so adding extra congestion from several cars owned by new residents of proposed flats would not be safe for them or other local residents as drivers, cyclists or pedestrians. This roundabout is already so busy at peak rush hour and school dropoff and pickup times, as well as whenever there is a delivery van beside One Stop and whenever customers park their cars outside One Stop. My father only had one car and used to find it hard enough turning out onto Yardley Park Road at peak times. Whilst my</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>parents lived there, there were some car accidents. My father went out on a few occasions to offer help after some small car accidents, even once at 2am. Increasing the amount of cars at this corner would not be safe.</p> <p>The proposal to demolish [REDACTED] and replace it with flats received many objections from local residents when a planning application for 14 (later 13) flats was submitted to the TMBC Area 1 Planning Committee and many residents attended the meeting on 31st March 2022. The proposal was unanimously rejected by all the councillors at the meeting. Surely democracy should matter in this country and this lovely old building should not be knocked down for redevelopment.</p> <p>[REDACTED] is a delightful historic building and garden. Edwardian properties should be preserved for future generations to appreciate. [REDACTED] should not be included as a site for the Local Plan.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42662561	Question 8	<p>ID 59623 [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] was built before the 1911 Census. Its inclusion within an Conservation Area is due to the historic nature of the building. Demolishing one of the oldest examples removes part of the area's future appeal. The Land Registry's Title Number K634595 explains in the Schedule of restrictive covenants how the road's character was created: each plot having "one detached house or pair of semi-detached houses" (1.1) and "No building is to be erected nearer than Forty feet to Yardley Park Road and no protection therefrom to be built except one storey porches or bays not extending more than Four Feet from the main wall. All buildings shall range in line." (1.2)</p> <p>The noise and traffic disruption or [REDACTED]'s proposed demolition for the construction of new flats would impact the community significantly, particularly on two sides of a busy junction. Vehicles attached to the new flats would cause extra problems on the busy junction of Yardley Park Road and the Shipbourne Road with the latter being very narrow beside [REDACTED] and only local residents, pupils at local schools and their families understand the impact on pedestrians and vehicular access through increased traffic and delays.</p> <p>Why destroy a lovely garden? In the Covid-19 pandemic families in flats wanted to own a house and have a garden. Why can't [REDACTED] be preserved for future families to enjoy after the current family's renovations during 2009-2014? Given the government's climate change commitments, not just older trees contribute - younger trees should become mature trees. The Queen's Commonwealth Canopy and The Queen's Green Canopy weren't created for trees' destruction - why should [REDACTED]'s garden lose even more?</p> <p>Given HM King Charles III's appreciation of the Commonwealth and the appointment of our first British Indian Prime Minister, I'm surprised that Robert Lyons Sevenoaks' connection isn't a reason to save [REDACTED]. He was the Superintending Architect (earlier described as the Clerk of Works) for the iconic and famous Victoria Memorial Hall in Calcutta, India (cf "Indian Engineering" Vol 34 page 380 with details published on 12th December 1903).</p> <p>K634595 said "No stables or out-buildings to be erected on the Plots except at the extreme back limits thereof. No greenhouses or conservatories to be erected except in such a way as shall not be detrimental to the comfort or convenience of the adjoining Owners" (1.3). The current plan is very detrimental to the adjoining owners, neighbours in the local area (given the number of objections submitted to the proposal that was discussed by TMBC Area 1 Planning Committee on 31st March 2022) and pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.</p> <p>There's a contradiction between conserving an area and creating infill via urban planning. New buildings shouldn't destroy popular historic areas. Brownfield sites should have priority and infill only on appropriate sites. There is a road in Maidenhead with 1 house on each plot that is now full of new flats and this has changed the area's character. [REDACTED]'s proposed demolition shouldn't start a trend for creating new buildings that would obliterate the history of our town, country and Commonwealth.</p>	<p>The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Open Space Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42752193	Question 8	<p>IDs 59735, 59798, 59804 & 59835 are areas where (on my deeds) it shows an Oil Pipe Line which has protection orders preventing the development of the land around and above.</p> <p>IDs 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804 & 59835 are green belt areas and comprise streams, woodland and farmland. It's protected for a reason and surely any loss would affect the well-being and any "green credentials" that you say is also part of your decision-making process. Services in our area are (schools, shops and medical) exist but if you were to develop around here, you would need to greatly increase capacity or build new and also develop the infrastructure to cope with those increases, once again, this would increase things such as traffic and hence pollution etc. My area, Horns Lodge Lane, is used for leisure and local agricultural use and access via the local footpaths for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders would be lost and with it, goals in your plan for supporting physical and mental well-being etc. Whilst you may think Climate Change is an issue, I am far more concerned with pollution both noise and real pollutants (not CO2) which may affect the population not only through the activities of development but any resultant increases in traffic etc. A proper benefit analysis would be needed.</p> <p>Finally, our area being semi-rural does not benefit from Gas or Mains drainage. Whilst we have overhead electricity and finally, fibre optic broadband we are still reliant on Oil fired central heating and septic tanks and klargesters and so any developments would not only have to consider these things being provided, but they would also have to be installed over long distance and in many cases, major enabling work and all that would mean to the countryside would need to be considered.</p>	The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42499585	Question 8	<p>If this question does not relates to potential sites identified for potential development in Borough Green, Wrotham and Ightham then please can you attach the comments below to the correct section of the consultation.</p> <p>With reservations the following applies:-</p> <p>Ismays Road 59608 - 37 dwellings:- impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Dark Hill Farm 59709 - mixed use - impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Gracelands 59720 - 198 dwellings - impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Rectory Lane 59770 - mixed use - impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Gracelands - 59871 - 28 dwellings - impinges upon biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational.</p> <p>Borough Green Road 59793 - 4 dwellings - the wishes of nearby owners need to be upheld else they may suffer great upheaval and may suffer mentally. They may feel they have to sell up and move away from a home that they loved. Existing owners should not feel that they have to move else where because of a new development.</p> <p>Borough Green Garden City - 59830 - 3000 + dwellings. Huge negative impact on biodiversity and increases pressure on local services such as medical and educational. TMBC has a safeguarding duty to existing residents to protect open areas, especially greenbelt. Loss of open space is not good for mental health. A development of this size and scale</p> <p>Ightham Bypass -59872 - 3 dwellings - Feelings from nearby home owners need to be upheld.</p>	The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42681825	Question 8	<p>I'm not saying 'Yes' or 'No' to particular sites but supplying details that should be taken into consideration. Important factors re all Hadlow sites. As far as I'm aware, the primary school is only taking new pupils if they have siblings there; the Dentist is not taking any more NHS patients & the Doctors list is full.</p> <p>59601 Originally safeguarded because of its amenity value for the setting of the village & the Grade 1* Listed Hadlow Tower. Has a high water table & is in the flood plain of the river Bourne. The owner has enhanced its biodiversity by planting trees & he doesn't want to build on the land.</p> <p>59605 One part of a much bigger field lying along the A26 recently taken over by travellers. Entire field has been wild grazed by horses. Bordered on the west side by a series of ponds connected to streams & ponds to the north. Lonewood Way, the last houses at this end of the village, regularly floods in heavy rain. Any further development can only result in more flooding. There have been quite a few accidents at the junction adjacent to the site.</p> <p>59635 A planning application is already under consideration & has been objected to, principally on the grounds of inadequate road access/congestion, inadequate health & schooling facilities & inappropriate design features. A traffic count in 2019 showed a figure of 2007 motor vehicle movements (count site number: 810327).</p> <p>59637 Previously used for fruit growing. Land abuts narrow Cemetery Lane to the north. Bell-mouth onto the A26 is tight & cannot currently be improved as there are houses on the south side & a private garden to the north. Underground stream runs diagonally across the land which manifests itself during prolonged rain & floods the footpath from Cemetery Lane. Stream is part of the system which runs from Gover Hill, across the A26, thence to Caxton Place ponds (off Court Lane), into the Bourne & eventually the Medway. Land is Grade 2. Rural in aspect. Good views to Hadlow Tower.</p> <p>59638 Meadow, regularly used for grazing sheep. Provides part of the setting of James House (17thC, Grade 2 listed), a view which includes converted oasts seen down an avenue of mature trees. Pond fronting the site & adjacent to A26 is fed from a pond on the west side of the road & a stream from the north. Water flows down to the river Bourne in a culvert under the A26. In 1968 Hadlow village was flooded due to the pond & culvert being overwhelmed by water flowing off Gover Hill. The only vehicular access is the drive serving James House & the oasts. Track would have to be widened, threatening the avenue of mature trees & would be immediately adjacent to the listed house.</p> <p>59686 Field to the rear of James House forms part of the setting of the listed building. Some waterlogging. Previously used for fruit growing & sheep & horse grazing. The only vehicular access is the drive serving James House & the oasts. Track would have to be widened, threatening the avenue of mature trees & would be immediately adjacent to the listed house. Grade 2 land</p> <p>59647 Land has been used for fruit growing & grazing. The site abuts Court Lane. Court Lane is a rat run during rush hour carrying traffic to & from East Peckham & Tonbridge via Golden Green. Traffic count in 2019 showed a figure of 2007 motor vehicle movements (count site number: 810327). Single lane width between the access to site 59635 & the A26 due to on-street parking. Not suitable for carrying yet more traffic from another new development, especially if site 59635 goes ahead. Grade 2 land.</p> <p>59776 Land is subject to some flooding. Currently used as rough grazing for horses. Access would be off narrow & winding Carpenters Lane, which is not suitable for substantially more development. Alternative access through The Paddock or the car park at the Village Hall would be intolerable for current residents. Currently no footway along Carpenters Lane after Hope Farm. The road is a rat run in rush hour.</p> <p>59795 Currently only sporadic development of single houses & bungalows, sited in large gardens, along this part of Ashes Lane. A small estate of houses would be out of keeping with this rural part of the parish which is some distance from local amenities. There is no footway in Ashes Lane & no immediate public footpath access across the fields to the village. It has a pleasant open rural aspect with tall mature trees across 2/3rds of the site. Currently used for grazing</p>	<p>The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>sheep.</p> <p>59811 Mainly grassland grazing for sheep & cattle. Some crop growing adjacent to Oxenhoath Road & Common Road. Hops & fruit in the northern section at Gover Hill. Any development would be intrusive in the rural landscape. Open views of village & Hadlow Tower. Protected parkland? The whole area was the ancient impaled parkland belonging to Oxenhoath. In 1968 water flowing from Gover Hill & Oxenhoath caused flooding in Hadlow. No footway access to Hadlow. No public transport.</p> <p>59842 Used for grazing sheep. Part of old parkland belonging to a large house. There were originally some fine old trees on the land. It has a high water table which feeds into the Bourne & Medway rivers. Has been the subject of several failed planning applications. It would be pushing the village boundary further into the Greenbelt which is not acceptable.</p> <p>59853/59857 Currently greenhouses & teaching facilities for Hadlow College & orchard. No indication of what would go into the mixed development. It would mean more traffic feeding into narrow & inadequate country roads – Court Lane & Victoria Road - as already outlined. People recreationally walk down Victoria Road which has no footway. It would be pushing the village boundary further into the Greenbelt which is not acceptable.</p> <p>59859 The land is in the floodplain of the Bourne & really floods (photo evidence). Used for ploughing practise by Hadlow College students. Community allotment on the land. What mixed use? Houses? Work? College activity? Backland over-development. More concrete means higher flood risk.</p>	
42798817	Question 8	In general I agree with the findings, however the devil is in the detail and so it is difficult to respond to this without having seen the detailed plans that comprised decision-making and related inputs which informed the summary presented within Annex 1.	Comments noted.
42213665	Question 8	<p>In general, I agree with the findings but would like to emphasise my opinions according to the following principles:</p> <p>Small "infill" developments on sites with good existing infrastructure should be encouraged.</p> <p>The development of large "greenfield" sites for example: site numbers 59594,59740,59631,59749 should be opposed to preserve agricultural land.</p> <p>The development of large areas of open space for example: site numbers 59861,5619-21,59636,59698,59715 should be opposed to prevent urban sprawl and the merging of different locales into continuous urbanisation.</p> <p>There should be no northward extension of Kings Hill for example: site numbers 59643,59655,59807,59814. For the same reasons.</p> <p>There should be no southward extension to Kings Hill for example: site numbers 59752,59759,59761,59797. For the same reasons.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42062017	Question 8	<p>In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550 and 59552, will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>The selection of sites 59550 and 59552, will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>There will be a signiScant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	
42773793	Question 8	<p>In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>As a local resident, the traffic along this stretch of road is already at an unacceptable level.</p> <p>Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>population increase.</p> <p>None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42834145	Question 8	In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765, and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roads out along the A26 from Brook street, St Stephens, Vale Road.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42752033	Question 8	Individual Site Assessment (Annex 1) has not been reviewed in detail - no comment on this Question.	Comment noted.
45509121	Question 8	individual site objections and rationale to those objections are given in the earlier parts of the document.	Comment noted.
45430305	Question 8	<p>individual site objections and rationale to those objections are given in the earlier parts of the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land within Site 59740 includes the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation Area the visual amenity of which, from both within and without was a strong factor in its classification. At the eastern side of the Site 59740, is a second Conservation Area, Mill Street, including the historic hamlet of Well Street with its very large proportion of listed buildings e.g. 'The Barracks' reputed to be a militia house from the English Civil War. Any development in this green space will impact Geology (Hydro)*, Wildlife, Access, Roads Infrastructure* Site 59449 is specific green space that local residents use on a daily basis to enable their children to play in a safe space, dog walkers also use multiple times per day, this is particularly beneficial for lone women and children who walk their dogs in this area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is immediately located next to two apartment blocks, both of which house children, there will be no local green space amenity within close proximity for these children to be supervised in a safe place. Mothers bring their young children and babies down to the Green on a regular basis for picnics. Fathers with their children play football and other sports. Green space helps prevent anti-social behaviour and promotes healthy lifestyle through play and engagement and helps to fight against mental health issues and promotes the health of developing children. Green space and trees help improve air quality by reducing urban temperatures. Vegetation absorbs carbon dioxide and helps offset greenhouse emissions helping to significantly reduce premature air related deaths Also stores carbon helping to mitigate climate change and reduce the risk of flooding Bats are known to live in this green space and has been submitted to the national bat conservation group Site 59643 – Hoath Wood ancient woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal/residential dwellings adjoining Lavendar Road: This will bring harm to the conservation areas. Ancient woodland and tree preservation orders, countryside, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of the existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted on local roads, visual impairment from AONB. Site 59655 – Road to North Pole behind Victory Drive consists of Green belt areas and countryside, any development will cause considerable harm to quiet lanes and rural road networks. This site is outside of the confines of existing development and will also result in the loss of agricultural land and added traffic congestion on already restricted local roads. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42814561	Question 8	Individual sites should not build over existing community facilities in settlements. I consider that sites should not be selected that build over community facilities such as children's playgrounds, green areas within dense housing, shopping facilities regularly used in urban areas, woodlands next to urban areas enjoyed by the community etc. Where sites selected have a detrimental effect on the community by removing such facilities, equal focus and investment should given to how to enable new close at hand and accessible replacements for the impacted community.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42822561	Question 8	Infrastructure details, climate change considerations and meaningful assessments as Q7 required.	Comments noted.
45716769	Question 8	It appears to have been written by somebody who is trying to confuse the lay person.	Comments noted.
42440961	Question 8	Largely, but these macro assessments and principles must be tempered with actual local specific consideration.	Noted.
42671521	Question 8	Leybourne has very limited green space to enjoy and use for relaxation. With the already approved sites at Broadwater and others we are already losing our green space.	Comments noted.
42801825	Question 8	<p>LOCAL PLAN SITE OBJECTIONS - KINGS HILL AREA</p> <p>Due to it's rural location, I don't agree that the below sites within Kings Hill should be included in the local plan. This would see the destruction of conservation areas and green belt.</p> <p>Site 59424 Residential 164 dwellings - Woods at end of Clearheart Lane Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEFRA Forest Inventory • Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees • Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill • Harm to protected species • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Impact on Local Residents of main access • Impact on wildlife corridor <p>Site 59531 Residential 13 dwellings - Tower View [Green] (South East) Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space <p>Site 59534 Residential 18 dwellings - Tower View [Green] (North West) Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space <p>Site 59544 Residential 5 dwellings - Conservation Area off Bancroft Lane Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Harm to non-listed heritage assets, preservation order <p>Site 59547 Residential 6 dwellings - Discovery Drive next to Conservation Area Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Open Space 	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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including an Open Space Study.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas <p>Site 59630 Mixed Use TBC (est. 157) dwellings - Fields North of Amber Lane Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Green Belt • Loss of countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59631 Residential 136 dwellings - Wateringbury Road, Heath Farm fields next to Sports Centre Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Public Open Space for Kings Hill • Destruction of countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59634 Residential 104 dwellings - Hoath Wood Ancient Woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal Reasons for objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Ancient Woodland and TPOs (Most of site) • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59655 Residential 143 dwellings - On Road to North Pole behind Victory Drive Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Loss of countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59740 Mixed Use (Est 3,000) dwellings - Broadwater Farm Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Inadequate resources – KCC indicate suggested school location not economic, no retail centre, lack of public transport including recently cancelled bus services! <p>Site 59761 Residential 86 dwellings - Kate Reed Wood (inc. Lumber Yard) Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland (Part of site) • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>59752 Residential 1390 dwellings - South of Lapins Lane (Phase 1) to A26 Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland (Part of site) • Green Belt • Loss of countryside • Access issues to local roads which are already under pressure <p>Site 59797 Residential 1228 dwellings - West quarter of Kings Hill golf course to A26 Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Green Belt • Destruction of countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Access issues to local roads which are already under pressure <p>Site 59800 Residential 275 dwellings - East Quarter of Kings Hill golf course Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Loss of countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59802 Residential 644 dwellings - East of Canon Lane, South of Hollandbury Park Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Destruction of countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams 	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59884 Residential 21 dwellings - Tower View Green Area (North East)</p> <p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space and community wellbeing- was ear marked for trim trail? 	
38435937	Question 8	<p>Many Sites are incorrectly described as being near a Railway Station when the railway is on the other side of the river and there is no nearby bridge (59766, 59851, 59674, 59670, 59678, 59847)</p> <p>59676 - Development on the east side of this site would have a negative impact on the setting of Listed Buildings to the north and south.</p> <p>There would also be a negative impact on the view to and from the North Downs AONB.</p> <p>Development on Sites 59831, 59675, 59763, 59702 would have a negative impact on the setting of the North Downs AONB</p>	Comments noted.
42775905	Question 8	<p>Many sites are overly intrusive development in areas of the Green Belt and AONB without any realistic infrastructure in place to support them.</p> <p>Distance to bus stops and railway stations does not correlate with greater use. Many roads are unsuitable to accomodate additional traffic, which also impacts climate change further.</p> <p>Site 59608 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59830 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59793 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59872 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59770 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59709 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59871 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.</p> <p>Site 59720 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		support population adequately. Site 59794 - Site located in AONB / Green Belt. Inappropriate for development. Existing infrastructure already does not support population adequately.	
42814401	Question 8	Many sites at issue, ranging from removal of local green areas to cataloguing of sites that are not available for development e.g. 5 holes of Kings Hill golf course, areas that would be infrastructure nightmares if they were to go ahead. E.g. site 59802, privately owned agricultural land selected for c.650 houses off Cannon Lane (a single track lane with private houses either side), Wateringbury, that would have huge access issues to the lane from the blind corner of the A26, too narrow to cater for the traffic, or means of gaining without knocking down dwellings in Kings Hill and performing extensive road widening. Sites exiting onto the A228 would cause further congestion on existing infrastructure that has limited scope for improvements given the constraints of the road as it is.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42750113	Question 8	Multiple sites are on flood risk areas and should not be built on.	Comments noted. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
42716897	Question 8	My answer is limited to sites in Hildenborough and is qualified by my specific observations in my separate response to these sites.	Comments noted
42793089	Question 8	My answer is limited to sites in Hildenborough and is qualified by my specific observations in my separate response to these sites.	Comments noted
42817185	Question 8	My answer refers only to Grange Farm and Greentrees form part of the MGB and are very productive agricultural land	Comments noted
42616225	Question 8	My comments are for the land on Grange Farm and Green Trees. I object to any Development on these sites for these reasons 1-They consist of productive agricultural land,grade 1,2,3a. 2-They are a important part of Green Belt. 3-They are prone to flooding . 4-This development will put pressure on health and education services. 4-Development will lead to loss of biodiversity.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42456385	Question 8	<p>My comments refer to the following sites situated to the north of Tonbridge on land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746689	Question 8	<p>My comments refer to the following sites: 59685 / 59690 / 59693 / 59721 / 59805 / 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt and fulfil all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principle reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of (Grades 1, 2, 3A) Best, Most Valuable agricultural land, the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages. This classification has been confirmed by the MAFF survey report of April 1991 which was carried out by TMBC. 3) The land is very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will worsen existing traffic congestion on the A26 into Tonbridge along with other local roads. The situation will be exacerbated by the proposed development in Paddock Wood and Tudeley (part of TWBC local plan) Traffic will cut-through local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a loss of biodiversity 6) Development will put more stress on already stretched local services in Health and education. 7) Development will permanently alter the open, semi-rural. Low density character of north Tonbridge. 8) There will be a negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to expansion of the town boundaries and resulting population increase. 9) The sites are not easily accessible to local facilities...shops, schools. medical facilities etc. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42140193	Question 8	<p>My reasons for objection Site: 59884 - Tower View - Green area (North East) Residential 21 dwellings - This development surrounds Tower View, Maypole Drive, Kendall Avenue. Reasons for objections - change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre, loss of public open space and loss of tree canopy.</p> <p>Site: 59531 - Tower View - Green area (South East) Residential 13 dwellings - This development surrounds Tower View, Melrose Avenue, Braeburn Way, Alfriston Grove, Bovarde Avenue. Reasons for objections - Reasons for objections - change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre, loss of public open space and loss of tree canopy.</p> <p>Site: 59534 - Tower View - Green area (North West) Residential 18 dwellings - This development surrounds Tower View, Woodford Grove, Cardinal Walk. Baxter Way, Hazen Road, Kendall Avenue. Reasons for objections - Reasons for objections - change of character of the area, traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre, loss of public open space and loss of tree canopy.</p> <p>Site 59424 Residential 164 dwellings Woods at end of Clearheart Lane Reasons for objections: DEFRA Forest Inventory; Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees; Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill; Harm to protected species; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Impact on Local Residents of main access; Impact on wildlife corridor</p> <p>Site 59544 Residential 5 dwellings Conservation Area off Bancroft Lane Reasons for objections: Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas; Harm to non-listed heritage assets, preservation order</p> <p>Site 59547 Residential 6 dwellings Discovery Drive next to Conservation Area Reasons for objections: Loss of Green Open Space; Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas</p> <p>Site 59631 Residential 136 dwellings Wateringbury Road, Heath Farm fields next to Sports Centre Reasons for objections: Existing Public Open Space for Kings Hill; Countryside; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads</p> <p>Site 59634 Residential 104 dwellings Hoath Wood Ancient Woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal Reasons for objections; Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas; Ancient Woodland and TPOs (Most of site); Countryside; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads; Visual Impact from AONB</p> <p>Site 59740 Mixed Use (Est 3,000) dwellings Broadwater Farm Reasons for objections: Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas; Proposed Green Belt; Countryside; Harm to the aquifer for streams; Harm to non-listed heritage assets; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads; Inadequate resources – KCC indicate suggested school location not economic, no retail centre</p> <p>59752 Residential 1390 dwellings South of Lapins Lane (Phase 1) to A26 Reasons for objections: Ancient Woodland (Part of site); Green Belt; Countryside; Access issues to local roads</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59797 Residential 1228 dwellings West quarter of Kings Hill golf course to A26 Reasons for objections: Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas; Green Belt; Countryside; Harm to the aquifer for streams; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads</p> <p>Site 59800 Residential 275 dwellings East Quarter of Kings Hill golf course Reasons for objections: Green Belt; Countryside; Harm to the aquifer for streams; Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks; Outside of the confines of existing developments; Loss of agricultural land; Traffic restricted on local roads</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772225	Question 8	<p>My response focuses on sites in the Hadlow Parish (14 sites) as well as some proposed sites North of Hadlow (6) and along the eastern edges of Tonbridge (7) which would have an effect on Hadlow:</p> <p>1) All sites in Hadlow and North of Hadlow fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) The following 17 sites in and around Hadlow consist of productive, Best Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages: 59410, 59601, 59637, 59647, 59686, 59776, 59811, 59859, 59842, 59747, 59806, 59846, 59685, 59689, 59693, 59721, 59805 These comprises two-thirds (63%) of sites offered within the Parish of Hadlow and just beyond it's borders. Development on these sites will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use. Given current food insecurities agricultural land should be safeguarded against development.</p> <p>3) The following 17 sites in and around Hadlow are within Flood zone 3, with a risk of flooding given as 1 in 30 years: 59410, 59601, 59637, 59638, 59647, 59776, 59811, 59859, 59842, 59747, 59806, 59846, 59685, 59689, 59693, 59805. These comprise two-thirds (63%) of sites offered within the Parish of Hadlow and just beyond it's borders. They have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both mainly from surface water flooding due to more development, resulting in a huge increase in areas unable to soak up any intense of prolonged rainfall, increasing the risk of flash flooding.</p> <p>4) Large development sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion along the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads as well as much increased demand on rail and bus services, as well as parking provision.</p> <p>5) Sites 59806 & 59811 contain an area of ancient woodland, and should not be developed or development scaled back significantly to ensure the survival of the woodland and ability for local population to enjoy the nature around them.</p> <p>6) Sites 59806, 59811, 59846, 59805 are listed as being in Water Source Protected Zone 1 areas. Given the increased likelihood of hotter summers leading to water shortages and droughts, local water sources must be protected and should be safeguarded against development.</p> <p>7) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town. TMBC must ensure that habitats are created along edges of open space and alongside waterways and are maintained to allow for wildlife migration and habitat protection.</p> <p>8) Infrastructure to enable active travel within and between settlements should be part of any new strategic development plan. This must go beyond the criteria of having access to bus routes, since bus services in Kent are underfunded and are under threat of either having reduced services or be cut altogether.</p> <p>9) Medical facilities in Hadlow are already oversubscribed.</p> <p>10) The number of households for Hadlow is 1,369 households (arrived at by subtracting number of households for Mereworth and Wst Peckham from total numbers given as 1,796 in the UK Census). The sites put forward for development would result in an extra 992 homes being built. This would mean Hadlow would see an increase of 172% over the next 17 years. This would totally overwhelm the existing roads, road junctions, transport, medical and educational infrastructure.</p>	<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.</p>
42471617	Question 8	n/a	Comments noted
42012033	Question 8	N/a	Comments noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38330881	Question 8	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted
42533729	Question 8	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted
43472865	Question 8	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted
44695393	Question 8	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted
44953857	Question 8	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted
45811329	Question 8	No - Cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted
44954561	Question 8	No - Do not understand it	Comments noted
42637441	Question 8	<p>No - I think a lot of the Tonbridge sites will just cause more problems with traffic management and air quality. Traffic itself is a nightmare around Tonbridge.</p> <p>In the North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by the proposals in that area will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>Also some of the Tonbridge sites are taking away amenity open spaces for our communities which are regularly used for sport, exercise etc which all support the mental well being of the local communities being able to get out and about and engage in nature.</p> <p>None of the sites identified on the green belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</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.
42707873	Question 8	No - it makes no sense	Comments noted
42444129	Question 8	No - many of the sites are unsuitable due to poor access, lack of transport and health care. Some of the green belt sites in Mereworth are totally unsuitable being located along single track country lanes. We have already seen the impact of the former Tatham site in Willow Wents which had no site access or parking. This resulted in large lorries travelling a single track lane, causing significant damage and unloading in the road, blocking it for long periods of time causing disruption and potentially stopping emergency vehicles getting through. Contractors vehicles had to park in Butchers Lane creating problems for local residents and other delivery vehicles, There are insufficient parking spaces resulting in congestion elsewhere. Access onto the B2018 Seven Mile Lane is unsuitable as is the A26 and A228 sites. There would need to be a reduction in the speed limits on these roads and roundabouts and traffic lights, all of which would cause congestion. There would need to be new GP surgeries which are already under pressure as are the 2 hospitals at Maidstone and Pembury, mostly due to acute staffing shortages and national NHS vacancies of over 100,000. There are not the extra staff to cope with the increased demand in patients.	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.
25066369	Question 8	No cannot make any sense of it	Comments noted
42496417	Question 8	No cannot make sense of it	Comments noted
42368129	Question 8	no comment	Comments noted
42443745	Question 8	no comment	Comments noted
42107937	Question 8	No further comment.	Comments noted
42255873	Question 8	No new developments	Comments noted
45821153	Question 8	NO Re: Site 59770 Mixed Use. I have the following objections: [Added under comment for Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted]	Comments noted
42508833	Question 8	NO Re: Site 59770 Mixed Use. I have the following objections: [Added under comment for Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted]	Comments noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42806753	Question 8	<p>No sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities (retail, schools, medical facilities).</p> <p>Expanding the town boundaries and population increase will have a negative impact on the functioning of the town centre.</p> <p>Some sites are areas in which flooding has been identified as being at huge increase risk.</p> <p>Any development that increases traffic is unacceptable.</p> <p>The extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59801, 59804 will worsen the existing traffic bottle neck between Yardley Park Road and Portman Park.</p> <p>Proposed Site 59623 will cause increased traffic and danger at the roundabout at Yardley Park Road and Shipbourne Road.</p>	<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.</p>
42588385	Question 8	No the whole report is not sustainable there is a big enough population all ready.	Comments noted
42589793	Question 8	<p>No, my opinions on particular sites are below:</p> <p>59720 - Gracelands - This should be declined as it significantly reduces the gap between Ightham and Borough Green.</p> <p>59709 - Darkhill Farm - This should be declined as it removes the gap between Ightham and Borough Green.</p> <p>59794 - A25 Borough Green Rd - This should be declined as it significantly reduces the gap between Ightham and Borough Green.</p> <p>59830 - Borough Green Garden City - This should be declined as it removes the gap between Ightham/Wrotham/Platt and Borough Green. Also for many other reasons, including the disproportionate size of the expansion of Borough Green, the scale of additional local traffic.</p>	<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.</p>
46004001	Question 8	No. Did not understand.	Comments noted
45825665	Question 8	No. It makes no sense.	Comments noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
39011745	Question 8	<p>No. The assessment is not balanced and does not cover overall impact. Two easily identified examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on car parks in West Malling does not consider the impact of loss of those resources on local businesses and the vibrancy of the village, or impact on access to the rural hubs, e.g. for local businesses in Kings Hill that need to provide accommodation for visiting staff, or residents accessing libraries or post offices or the myriad of different small shops in the area. • Building on Hoath Wood has been designated as Brownfield, even though much of the area is Ancient Woodland protected by TPO (for which unlawful action has been reported to TMBC but no response has been received). As such, the validity of the assessment is severely at doubt. <p>Site 59424 DEFRA Forest Inventory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland and TPO protected trees • Over Development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill • Harm to protected species • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Impact on Local Residents of main access • Impact on wildlife corridor <p>Site 59531 Change of character of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space • Soak-away area for local roads; removal will result in more flooding <p>Site 59534 Change of character of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space • <p>Site 59544</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Harm to non-listed heritage assets, preservation order • <p>Site 59547</p> <p>Loss of Green Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • <p>Site 59630</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59631</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Public Open Space for Kings Hill • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59634</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Ancient Woodland and TPOs (Most of site) • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Visual Impact from AONB <p>Site 59655</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59740</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Proposed Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads • Inadequate resources – KCC indicate suggested school location not economic, no retail centre <p>Site 59752</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>Site 59761</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland (Part of site) • Green Belt • Countryside • Access issues to local roads <p>Site 59797</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to conservation areas or harm to significance of conservation areas • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59800</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59802</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Countryside • Harm to the aquifer for streams • Harm to non-listed heritage assets • Harm to quiet lane and rural road networks • Outside of the confines of existing developments • Loss of agricultural land • Traffic restricted on local roads <p>Site 59884</p> <p>Example reasons for objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of character of the area • Traffic impact to/from Kings Hill centre • Loss of public open space 	
44304385	Question 8	<p>No. The assessment is not balanced and does not cover overall impact. Two easily identified examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on car parks in West Malling must consider the impact of loss of those resources on local businesses and the vibrancy of the village, or impact on access to the rural hubs, e.g. for local businesses in Kings Hill that need to provide accommodation for visiting staff, or residents accessing libraries or post offices or the myriad of different small shops in the area. • Building on Hoath Wood has been designated as Brownfield, even though much of the area is Ancient Woodland protected by TPO (for which unlawful action has been reported to TMBC but no response has been received). <p>As such, the validity of the assessment is severely in doubt.</p> <p>Detailed or summary responses for sites in the area of Kings Hill are included below.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
44309601	Question 8	<p>No. The assessment is not balanced and does not cover overall impact. Two easily identified examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Building on car parks in West Malling must consider the impact of loss of those resources on local businesses and the vibrancy of the village, or impact on access to the rural hubs, e.g. for local businesses in Kings Hill that need to provide accommodation for visiting staff, or residents accessing libraries or post offices or the myriad of different small shops in the area. · Building on Heath Wood has been designated as Brownfield, even though much of the area is Ancient Woodland protected by TPO (for which unlawful action has been reported to TMBC but no response has been received). <p>Page 19 of 114</p> <p>As such, the validity of the assessment is severely in doubt.</p> <p>Detailed or summary responses for sites in Kings Hill are included below.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45657281	Question 8	<p>No. These are factually correct but are trying to justify housing development without concomitant improvements in the infrastructure.</p>	Comments noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
46010689	Question 8	No. These are factually correct but are trying to justify housing development without concomitant improvements in the infrastructure.	Comments noted
44236769	Question 8	No: individual site objections and rationale to those objections are given in the earlier parts of the document.	Comments noted
45217569	Question 8	No: individual site objections and rationale to those objections are given in the earlier parts of the document.	Comments noted
42168897	Question 8	No: individual site objections and rationale to those objections are given in the earlier parts of the document.	Comments noted
42167937	Question 8	None of these sites should be approved until sufficient pressure is placed on central government to work hand in glove with the borough to develop infrastructure. Otherwise residents will be placed in developments devoid of any services to the detriment of their mental health and the development of their offspring.	Comments noted
42593313	Question 8	<p>North Tonbridge sites: Greentrees and Grange Farm 59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>These are part of the Metropolitan Green Belt and for that reason were not included in the previous development plan. They are productive Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A). They are prone to flooding in wet weather with hidden springs bubbling when land is saturated. To develop these sites will increase peak traffic congestion on A26 into Tonbridge and surrounding roads. There would be a loss of biodiversity and the open, semi-rural, low density character of Tonbridge would be altered. Additional stress on already overstretched local educational and healthcare services. The expansion of the town boundaries and increased population will have a negative impact on the functioning of the town. These sites not easily accessible to local facilities. Also there are no pavements of street lights or access to main drainage</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42180641	Question 8	Not qualified to disagree	Comment noted.
42469569	Question 8	Not suitable to extend building in Watlington, due to very high pollution at the village centre cross roads	Comment noted.
42765665	Question 8	Not sure	Onmmenv nnved.
42727777	Question 8	Numerous sites mentioned are totally unsuitable.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42361345	Question 8	<p>Offham is a village with many historical connections. There are three conservation areas: Offham Green, Offham Church and Aldon; an 11th century church and 37 listed buildings.</p> <p>Site 59406 - Barfield House (20 Houses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and scope of the development not sustainable, nor appropriate, given the size of and locality to Offham. • The project sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham. • The project would lead to a material increase in traffic through the village, adding to pressures on roads already at capacity given the type of road and locality. • The location of the project makes vehicle access potentially dangerous due to the way in which vehicles would be required to pull out onto a fast road without clear line of sight. • The increase in traffic would almost certainly lead to a degradation of air quality within Offham. • Offham bus service is being removed as KCC funding withdrawn. No communication elsewhere by public transport will now exist. • The size of the project would put extra pressure on existing infrastructure - such as sewers and power networks. • The size of the project would put extra pressure on essential public services - e.g. doctors' surgery, and local schools. <p>Site 59596 - North of Site 59406 (23 Houses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and scope of the development not sustainable, nor appropriate, given the locality to Offham. • The project sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham. • The project sits within the zoned metropolitan green belt with the site being adjacent to ancient woodlands. and is thus inappropriate for development. • The project would lead to a material increase in traffic through the village, adding to pressures on roads already at capacity given the type of road and locality. • The location of the project makes vehicle access potentially dangerous due to the way in which vehicles would be required to pull out onto a fast road without clear line of sight. • The increase in traffic would almost certainly lead to a degradation of air quality within Offham. • Offham bus service is being removed as KCC funding withdrawn. No communication elsewhere by public transport will now exist. • The size of the project would put extra pressure on existing infrastructure - such as sewers and power networks. • The size of the project would put extra pressure on essential public services - e.g. doctors' surgery, and local schools. <p>Site 59648 - White Ladies (17 Houses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and scope of the development is not sustainable, nor appropriate. • The project sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham. • There will be a solar farm on the adjacent landfill site which would have a direct impact on any properties built at this location. Currently a landfill associated power station still operates in a section of this site (see below). • Gas risk - The landfill site is still active with respect to ground gases, still with occasional elevated methane (and CO2) and the exact migration pathway for the gas is uncertain. Offham Parish Council has not seen satisfactory evidence of safety regarding gas and noise within any current planning application. • Gas utilisation/electricity generation compound to south of site: <p>Residents at the Aldon Lane/Teston Road junction and in the Aldon Conservation area continue to report regular audible noise emanating from this equipment (350 - 500 metres) at night with the prevailing south westerly wind and also by day . Any residences at a distance of 50 metres from the equipment is likely to be substantially affected while the equipment is in place. (Current as of 3.11.22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway safety: Site lines are not perfect because of a slight curve in the road to the east. There are dangers present from the westerly approach, which Offham Parish Council and the local KCC member are well aware. This is an unsafe location for new houses to exit onto Teston Road. There is a speed unrestricted bend of 35-40 deg. which is at the 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>western end of this site and at the end of a 700 metre straight. Sight lines are limited. Early 2020, following concerns expressed, near misses, KCC Highways erected yellow warning signs either side of the adjacent bend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project site is contaminated and unsuitable for building due to the risk of gas leaks from the landfill site. Any housing within this project site is likely to be impacted by noise pollution from the utility generator to the south of the site. • Offham Parish Council is very concerned that this land is unsafe for residential development and contains contamination. <p>Site 59649 - Teston Road (9 Houses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and scope of the development is not sustainable, nor appropriate, given the locality to Offham. • The project sits outside of the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham. • The project would lead to a material increase in traffic through the village, adding to pressures on roads already at capacity given the type of road and locality. • The location of the project makes vehicle access potentially dangerous due to the way in which vehicles would be required to pull out onto a fast road without clear line of sight. • This site is immediately adjacent to the edge of a landfilled quarry site, the stability and consistency of the land being quite uncertain, in addition to the risk of gas migration. • Access is immediately onto an unrestricted road just outside the village gateway. It will be coincident with or extremely close to the access roadway into the proposed solar farm site. <p>Sites 59699, 59714, 59716, 59594, 59645 - strongly opposed because of these are sites of prime agricultural land in the green belt.</p> <p>Sites 59602, 59603, 59733 - not supported as will inappropriately 'fill in the gap' and connect Kings Hill and West Malling communities.</p> <p>Sites 59807, 59860 - not supported. Too close to historic village of West Malling and strongly opposed.</p>	
38377665	Question 8	Only looked at the sites in Aylesford, 59464, 59469, 59472 and 59781. I have no argument with any of these 4	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42517025	Question 8	<p>Our interest (by residence and desire to protect our local environ, while wishing to support the optimal development of Tonbridge and the wider borough) is particularly in the following sites, which are situated to the north-east of Tonbridge (Higham) toward Hadlow, on land we know as Greentrees and Grange Farm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59693) • 59685) together the 3 represent Greentrees • 59721) <p>and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 which also encompasses: • 59809 together the 2 represent Grange Farm <p>and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59805 which combines all the above 5 individual sites. <p>We agree with the negative findings for these collective sites with regard to loss of green belt / designated open space, capacity of services, building on Flood Zone 3. We object to any proposed development on these collective and individual sites, for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Designated Green Belt (we understand the precise reason why the sites have been precluded for previous plans) 2) Destruction of Grade 1-3 , essential agricultural land 3) The area is prone to flooding - something we have witnessed twice on the past few years. We also understand the land contains hidden springs which spill over when the land becomes drenched from very heavy rainfall. 4) There would be significant additional strain on the single main A26 road, which already suffers daily peak period traffic congestion, particularly toward Tonbridge (and we have mentioned already the threat from the Capel & Tudeley development). 5) We already suffer regular additional 'cut through' traffic, with excessive speeds and risks to residents, despite the 20mph restrictions, via Three Elm Lane, Cranford Road, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 6) Finally, the loss of green belt land would of course result in significant loss of biodiversity and geodiversity, and further change, irrevocably, the open, semi-rural, low-density character of this area of the borough. 	<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.</p>
42794209	Question 8	<p>Our site is Ref 59666. However there are several other sites that are close to us e.g. Ref 59702 and right next door and Ref 59826 relates to a further large area to the north, west and south of Eccles. If the development of Eccles was considered overall then our site would not be within a Poor Accessibility Band and it would be possible to envisage a creative and exciting major development opportunity for the Eccles area. If this was carried out with the correct approach, including a sympathetic understanding for the beautiful surrounding environment, it would be possible to plan a major development for the area which would provide both high quality and affordable housing with an appropriate mix of sized, types and tenures as well as new communal facilities and new employment opportunities. Looking at an area as a whole rather than by site can change the perceptions relating to each site. For example, from our site it would be possible to access the nearby motorways without traffic going through the village so a business park could provide employment without causing congestion in the village. Easy access to the AONB could be a hugely positive aspect for people living in the area if access was managed in a sensitive manner.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42469985	Question 8	<p>Please do not build on anything further which is green, brown land only!</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42757505	Question 8	<p>Please explain your answer and quote the individual site reference</p> <p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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.</p>
42438753	Question 8	Please see previous comment for all green field sites.	Comment noted.
42438785	Question 8	Proximity to essential services using cycle ways and footpaths are essential. Lots of rural areas have no footpaths or dedicated cycle ways.	Comment noted.
46102273	Question 8	<p>Q8 Do you agree with the Individual Site Assessments of the Interim SA Report, please details reasons for your answers quoting individual site reference numbers.</p> <p>Due to the volume of work associated with answering this question appropriately from a BAG perspective, work is ongoing in this area, however it is likely that BAG will be making a case for Site 59740 Broadwater Farm in its current form to be excluded from going forward in the Local Plan.</p>	Noted.
42391041	Question 8	<p>Quite simply the proposal for there to be 1400+ new homes around Burham means that the findings cannot be taken seriously.</p> <p>It will destroy wildlife, farmland and the rural community.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42829057	Question 8	<p>Re: Site 59770 Mixed Use. I have the following objections:</p> <p>The site has no access apart from Old Lane. Old Lane is single track and is not a maintained road. It also floods regularly. There is a gate to the field at the corner of Rectory Lane and the A25. However, this was illegally installed by a past owner, Mr J Slee, to support his unsuccessful application to build houses.</p> <p>The field is sited opposite the Ightham Recreation Park with its large car park and children's playground. The car park caters for parents to drop off and collect children who attend Ightham Primary School. If the proposed site was approved, there would be traffic chaos around the drop off and pick up times, which would increase the risk of traffic accidents involving school children.</p>	<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.</p>
42832641	Question 8	<p>Re: Site 59770 Mixed Use. I have the following objections:</p> <p>The site has no access apart from Old Lane. Old Lane is single track and is not a maintained road. It also floods regularly. There is a gate to the field at the corner of Rectory Lane and the A25. However, this was illegally installed by a past owner [REDACTED] to support his unsuccessful application to build houses.</p> <p>The field is sited opposite the Ightham Recreation Park with its large car park and children's playground. The car park caters for parents to drop off and collect children who attend Ightham Primary School. If the proposed site was approved, there would be traffic chaos around the drop off and pick up times, which would increase the risk of traffic accidents involving school children.</p> <p>In addition to the safety issues this development would constitute to the over development of a historical village.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42776321	Question 8	<p>Rectory Lane 59770 - Mixed Use tbc</p> <p>Access to this site is on to small single track lanes, in green belt land and limited facilities locally to accommodate an influx of residents. Old lane in particular is impassable from about 1/2 way down. This lane is also liable to flooding due the topology of the local.</p> <p>Borough Green Garden City 59830</p> <p>Massive loss of Green belt land and a hugely disproportionate site to developed in relation to the surrounding villages. Traffic is already an issue in Borough Green and Seven Oaks not just in the mornings/evening but at all times of day.</p> <p>Ightham Bypass 59872</p> <p>Tiny isolated plot with no road access</p> <p>108,59793,59871,59793,59709</p> <p>General loss of green space that give Ightham is rural charm. Building in these areas will remove the gap between Ightham & Borough green blurring the lines of a village and a larger settlement. There isnt the infrastructure in place, transport link or road network to adequately cope without making the area unpleasant and impractically to live in.</p>	<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.</p>
42774113	Question 8	<p>Rectory Lane site - 59770 - This site is placed next to a busy stretch of the A2, particularly during school times. The potential entrances to the site would exacerbate the congestion outside the school car park. Rectory Lane itself is a small lane really designed for one way traffic. The far end of Rectory Lane is difficult to exit due to visibility. The land is also greenbelt and should be protected at all costs.</p> <p>Darkhill Farm site - 59709 and Gracelands site 59720 also have poor access in terms of existing congestion.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42799713	Question 8	<p>Ref 59779 59827 and 59825 Shipbourne is a conservation area. If any areas were developed it would conflict with the GB policy and Kent Downs AONB. Reeds Lane and Back Lane are already a 'rat run' for the local stations and at school times. with cars racing through the lanes. Living in Reeds lane you take your life in your hands during rush hour.Public transport is limited. There is poor drainage to the Southern boundary. The area is green belt and should remain as such. The village has no gas so would put stress on the electric grid. There are issues with sewer overflow across 59827</p> <p>All three sites are totally unsuitable and this would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of a small village and a small school which already oversubscribed. Local GPs are already oversubscribed and building so many homes will put pressure on an already crumbling health service. Huge changes would need to be made to deliver on any of this and it would impact on the character and landscape of a small village. Alternative sites in a town should be considered rather than areas of local beauty.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42763841	Question 8	<p>Ref 59779 are on the Green Belt & Kent downs AONB on the edge of the Shipbourne Conversation area, There is extremely poor drainage on southern boundary, we often walk dogs in this area and its significantly boggy and does not dry up until the height of summer. Access on to Back lane would be significantly affected, during school times this road is blocked with cars from the primary school up to number 1 back lane on both sides, there are currently only 12 houses, added a proposed 35 more on one end or 80 the other would cause a complete grid lock, especially in school houses. This would not only cause congestion but a serious danger to school children. The traffic would also continue out on to the junction of back lane which is the A227 causing a high volume of cars to stop on a very busy road. There is currently a bus stop on the A227 that provides a school service and lastly there is an active covenant on this land restricting development, making it therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825 Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB is within the Shipbourne conversation area This is also a a very open site with dangerous access onto narrow upper green road & back lane. A proposed mixed development on this site is questionable, there is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne and would significantly harm current house prices and local surroundings.</p> <p>Site 59827 Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of a conservation area could be seen to cause harm to local nature and wildlife. There are land drainage issues not his site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary, There are already issues with the sewer overflow on this area adding an additional 82 houses would cause a serious problem to current and new residents.</p> <p>All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, if any of these sites were developed that would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict. Shipbourne conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne design statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of the this village. Any of these sites with the volume of houses proposed would have a huge negative impact on the rural, character and landscape of the area. Creating huge housing estates in between rural country houses would severally damage not just house prices of current residents but the rural feel of the village which is quaint and small and has currently No services other than a currently over subscribed school. The junctions at both ends of back land are dangerous and have cars regularly speeding at 3 x the speed limit, since the road is a cut through from the A228/A26 to A227 and cross country to the A21. these developments would cause a significant back log onto these roads which could result in severe accidents. The village of Shipbourne is currently not on the gas network so the electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		any new development. Sewerage is under pressure and overflows are already experiences Water provisions with the current systems are indadequate to accommodate a new development.	
42721697	Question 8	Ref 59789, this site sits between recreational land and the backs of many houses and gardens on The Freehold, which enjoy uninterrupted views, air quality, sound and natural light. This land is not only agricultural, supporting biodiversity but also contains a stream. Road access is currently very limited and the space is popular with dog walkers and those who enjoy walks. All of the above would be severely impaired should development be planned for this site.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council is also preparing an Open Space Study.
42716065	Question 8	Ref no59759/59760/ 59755/59758 These areas have insufficient access,pretty single tract roads that if made larger would ruin the whole village outlook. Where would the hedgerow wildlife go to. No infrastructure Ref no 59816 along the street in mereworth. This road is blocked especially at school times frequently with traffic having difficulty passing through	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.
42703521	Question 8	Ref: 59758, North of Beech Road is described as being in a flood zone. It is at the top of a hill. Ref: 59758, 59750, 59597, 59816, 59598, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59754, 59757 are accessed by roads that are already used beyond safe capacity.	Comment noted.
42765793	Question 8	Ref: 59779, 59825 and 59827. All these sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. Shipbourne is vulnerable to development: Upper Green Road is already heavily used and heavily parked upon, the latter especially on weekends. This makes it at times impossible to give access to the locals, who have to back up their car for 20 to 30 cars parked along the narrow road. The area around the school has not enough parking to provide a safe picking up of children as it is, let alone with 38 more households on a confined doorstep. There is no shop in Shipbourne or any other amenities. Everyone would have to drive to Tonbridge or further afield for their shopping and work. This would make all roads but especially the A227 through the village even more dangerous than it is. Amenities of gas, electricity, water and internet would have to be extended to accommodate any new housing. Gigaclear is the provider of fibre optic cables to a limited number of households. Connectivity for internet and mobile phones is not ideal as it is. These developments would totally change the atmosphere of this quiet backwater which at the moment has not more than 275 dwellings.	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.
42199073	Question 8	reference nos 59707 and 59731. This is grade 1 and 2 agricultural use located actually in the green belt and AONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42691361	Question 8	Reports do not adequately assess each site. The full impact of the AONB are not considered. The assessment of BGGC cannot be viewed as a single site. The site cannot be viewed in isolation it must be viewed with all other sites which fundamentally the community (schools etc) cannot support.	Comment noted.
42721633	Question 8	See 1367 in questions	Comment noted.
42044577	Question 8	See above	Comment noted.
42687265	Question 8	See above	Comment noted.
42820385	Question 8	See answer to Q5 above	Comment noted.
42322369	Question 8	See answer to Q7 above.	Comment noted.
42436577	Question 8	See comments made against individual sites in my area (Borough Green).	Comment noted.
42726913	Question 8	See comments on individual sites	Comment noted.
44275681	Question 8	See comments submitted on the SA.	Comment noted.
42805889	Question 8	See response to Q2	Comment noted.
43072865	Question 8	See Sustainability Appraisal	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42733217	Question 8	Several of the sites are not suitable for development. They are small opens spaces within existing housing areas or are existing sportsgrounds or car parks that should be retained for the use of residents.	Comment noted.
42705601	Question 8	<p>Shipbourne - sites 59779, 59825, 59827</p> <p>General points applicable to all three sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Green belt and AONB: All three sites are in the Green Belt (“GB”) and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“AONB”), and on that basis alone should not appear in the local plan. As a result, if any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with established planning policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which sets out how “to conserve and enhance natural beauty” in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000, rather than build over it. 2. Conservation Area: Furthermore, Shipbourne is an important heritage village, with the Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement setting out what is special and important about Shipbourne, and how vulnerable it is to development. One of these sites is within the conservation area and the other two on the very edge of the conservation area. 3. Deliverability: All three sites are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the GB. Development of any of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary school (which is already oversubscribed). 4. Lack of appropriate transport infrastructure: There are not sufficient transport links to Shipbourne to accommodate housing growth (the bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times). It would be more appropriate to build where existing transport links exist. 5. Lack of appropriate amenities: Shipbourne does not have any shops or other necessary amenities to accommodate growth (there is only a small primary school and a public house – no shops of any description). This would result in more car journeys. It would be more appropriate to build where shops and the other amenities of daily life are available. 6. Lack of appropriate utility infrastructure: The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new development in these sites. Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827 below. Current water utilities are inadequate to accommodate new development. 7. Impact on nature: The area is haven for nature (deer, badger, hawks etc) and building will dislocate the natural environment. <p>Further points applicable to specific sites in Shipbourne</p> <p>Site 59779</p> <p>In addition to the general points above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor drainage on this site, with waterlogging/flooding. • It is in my view incorrect to view the school as an “uncertain minor positive” in relation to SA objective 3, as we understand from the parish council that it is already oversubscribed with no prospect for expansion. This should be a negative. • It is incorrect, in our view to score this site as a minor positive in respect of SA objective 10. The bus stop referred to only provides a school service. As a result, any new residents would be dependent on their cars – with an attendant increase in greenhouse emissions. This in our view should be a significant negative. • For the same reason SA objective 11 should be scored a significant negative, and SA objective 12 at least a minor negative. • This site is directly opposite the school and the dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227 (potentially causing danger and congestion at pick up and drop off times). • We are also informed by the parish council that there is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59825</p> <p>In addition to the general points above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is in the conservation area. • As with site 59779, it is in our view incorrect to view the school as an “uncertain minor positive” in relation to SA objective 3, as we understand from the parish council that it is already oversubscribed with no prospect for expansion. This should be a negative. • Similarly, it is incorrect, in my view to score this site as only a minor negative in respect of SA objective 10. New residents would be dependent on their cars – with an increase in greenhouse emissions. This, in our view, should be a significant negative. • For the same reason SA objective 11 should be scored a significant negative, and SA objective 12 at least a minor negative. • In our view it is not correct to score SA objective 4 as a minor positive. In our view negligible is the correct score, as it would be wholly inappropriate in a village of this size, in the GB and AONB, to build industrial or retail opportunities for “economic growth” or “business development” opportunities. <p>Site 59827</p> <p>In addition to the general points above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importantly, we understand that there are land drainage issues and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. • The site has issues with sewage overflow. • As with site 59779 and 59825, it is in our view incorrect to view the school as an “uncertain minor positive” in relation to SA objective 3, as we understand from the parish council that it is already oversubscribed with no prospect for expansion. This should be a negative. • Similarly, it is incorrect, in our view to score this site as only a minor negative in respect of SA objective 10. New residents would be dependent on their cars – with an increase in greenhouse emissions. This in our view should be a significant negative. • For the same reason SA objective 11 should be scored a significant negative, and SA objective 12 at least a minor negative. • In our view it is incorrect to say that the significant negatives in respect of SA objectives 5, 6 and 7 should only be “uncertain”. Rather, they are “certain” significant negatives – with this site bordering Dene Wood and there being no cost-effective remediation that could maintain the biodiversity, landscape, character and cultural heritage. 	
42834625	Question 8	Shipbourne is a small village and the developments 59779,59827,59825 are completely disproportionate and would overwhelm it. They are all on Green Belt land in an AONB. There are no facilities in the village and the small school is already full. The roads are narrow and under strain at collection time at the school and nursery and at weekends when many come to enjoy walking in the area. There are few buses and fewer jobs.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42271969	Question 8	Site [59669] - [SEE COMMENTS AGAINST INTERIM SA REPORT ANNEX 1].	Comment noted.
44514401	Question 8	Site [59707] - [SEE DETAILED COMMENTS AGAINST THE INTERIM SA REPORT ANNEX 1]	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42605921	Question 8	<p>Site 59406 – Barfield Farm – 20 houses This piece of land sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham Village Together with Site 59596, this would be the equivalent of building another Pepingstraw Close on the edge of the Village. Such a development is not sustainable in a small village.</p> <p>There is one pub, one church, a single form entry primary school and a Farm Shop - part of the Spadework Charity at the opposite end of the Village to this site. Currently a bus service operates infrequently and after KCC will cease. Most residents are dependent on private transport.</p> <p>Traffic generation to and from the site will be of significance to the village. Offham village is a rat run for Kings Hill and other areas travelling to and from the A20/M26/20 intersections. At both morning/evening peak times there is a constant stream of traffic along Teston Road and the proposed site entrance is at a particularly point in the road where traffic speeds up leaving the Village and tends to speed into the Village before breaking heavily before the bend just past the proposed entrance. Vehicle movements from 20/43 more houses entering/exiting Teston Road would have a detrimental impact on traffic movements through the Village in addition to the added dangers of the location of access at this site.</p> <p>Site 59596 – field North of site 59406 – 23 houses This piece of land sits outside the defined rural settlement boundary of Offham Village and is in zoned Metropolitan Green Belt. Offham Parish Council is utterly opposed to any building on the Green Belt especially adjacent to semi natural, ancient woodland. Together with Site 59406, this would be the equivalent of building another Pepingstraw Close on the edge of the Village.</p> <p>There is one pub, one church, a single form entry primary school and a Farm Shop - part of the Spadework Charity at the opposite end of the Village to this site. Currently a bus service operates infrequently and after KCC will cease. Most residents are dependent on private transport. Such a development is not sustainable in a small village.</p> <p>Traffic generation to and from the site will be of significance to the village. Offham village is a rat run for Kings Hill and other areas travelling to and from the A20/M26/20 intersections. At both morning/evening peak times there is a constant stream of traffic along Teston Road and the proposed site entrance is at a particularly point in the road where traffic speeds up leaving the Village and tends to speed into the Village before breaking heavily before the bend just past the proposed entrance. Vehicle movements from 20/43 more houses entering/exiting Teston Road would have a detrimental impact on traffic movements through the Village in addition to the added dangers of the location of access at this site.</p> <p>Site 59648 – White Ladies Site, Teston Road – 17 houses There will be a solar farm on the adjacent landfill site which would have a direct impact on any properties built at this location. Currently a power station associated with the landfill is still operating in the south section of this site (see below).</p> <p>Gas risk - The landfill site is still active with respect to ground gases, still with occasional elevated methane (and CO2) and the exact migration pathway for the gas is uncertain. Our Parish Council has not seen satisfactory evidence of safety regarding gas and noise within any current planning application.</p> <p>Gas utilisation/electricity generation compound to south of site Residents at the Aldon Lane/Teston Road junction and in the Aldon Conservation area report regular audible noise</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>emanating from this equipment (350 - 500 metres) at night with the prevailing south westerly wind. Any residences at a distance of 50 metres from the equipment is likely to be substantially affected while the equipment is in place.</p> <p>Highway safety The site lines are not perfect because of a slight curve in the road to the east. There are dangers present from the westerly approach, dangers of which Offham Parish Council and the local County Council member are well aware. This is an unsafe location for new houses to exit onto Teston Road.</p> <p>There is a speed unrestricted bend of some 35-40 degrees which is at the westernmost end of the White Ladies site and at the end of a 700 metre straight. Sight lines are limited. In early 2020, following concerns expressed, near miss etc., KCC Highways erected yellow warning signs either side of the bend as a warning of this bend.</p> <p>The yellow background emphasises that one should pay particular attention to the warning information the sign is trying to convey; they are used to give you extra warning in accident-prone spots.</p> <p>The distance of visibility eastwards for vehicles approaching from the west, from the bend to the proposed gateway is 100 metres. Conversely a distance of 100 metres from the current gate eastwards is a straight line and even with the slight curve, the visibility is much better than the western approach with the bend.</p> <p>Vehicles are warned with the signs but many take the bend at speed. Our concern is that for vehicles exiting from the proposed gateway position this will create even more dangerous situations than leaving the gateway in its original position. Moving an exit closer to the bend is more dangerous than concerns about sight lines in the other direction.</p> <p>Cllrs are concerned that this land is unsafe for residential development and contains contamination.</p> <p>Site 59649 – Teston Road at NE edge of landfill site – 9 houses</p> <p>This is immediately adjacent to the edge of a landfilled quarry site, the stability and consistency of the land being quite uncertain, in addition to its risk of gas migration. Access is immediately on to an unrestricted road just outside the village gateway. It will also be coincident with or extremely close to the access roadway into the proposed solar farm site.</p>	
42562465	Question 8	<p>Site 59407: Small site with existing houses so likely to be over developed.</p> <p>Site 59492: This is an essential village carpark. Building here woulddisplace cars onto the congester highway.</p> <p>Site 59493: This is an essential station carpark. Building here woulddisplace cars onto the congester highway.</p> <p>Site 59877: This is a unique site of historic importance and character. It should be preserved in its current form and not over developed.</p> <p>Site 59880: I beleive this is Green Belt</p> <p>Site 59881: I beleive this is Green Belt</p> <p>Site 59712: I beleive this is Green Belt</p> <p>Site 59748: There is insufficient road access for the proposed size of this development. The character of the local area would suffer.</p> <p>Site 59794: Access to the road would be impossible.</p> <p>Site 59830: Over development on AONB and Greenbelt land. Insufficient bus & rail links, non-existant relief road, insufficient schooling and medical services, questionable land quality due to landfill sites.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. Associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42470433	Question 8	<p>Site 59424: Reasons for objection: DEFRA forest inventory, ancient woodland and TPO protected trees, over development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill, harm to protected species, outside of confines of existing developments, impact on local residents of main access, impact on wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Site 59531: Reason for objection: this would change the character of the area, it would lead to more traffic to/from Kings Hill centre and through Tower view, we would lose vital public space in Phase 2 - residents walk their dogs here, children play, communities make friends.</p> <p>Site 59534: Reason for objection: this would massively change the character of the area - as you enter Kings Hill down Tower view (one of 2 main entrances) this is the first green space you come to and it's the first green space which makes it look residential rather than like just a business park, it would lead to more traffic to/from Kings Hill centre and local roads which are already overwhelmed from the new development for the over 50+ which does not have enough parking and has massively impacted Hazen Road and Woodford Grove in a negative and dangerous way - coming into Hazen is very unsafe, where would the new road to this development be? If off Tower view it would cause traffic problems and congestion at roundabout, if Hazen or Woodford it would change the nature of these areas - Woodford is a quiet close and this would change this area completely and lead to lots of traffic, we would lose valuable green space - this particular green is where people walk dogs, there are always kids and families playing sports here, in the snow people sledge here, people buy lunches at Waitrose and sit and eat here - you are taking all that away from us. Also Our house is on Woodford on this green - when we bought our house, before buying it we phoned KCC and Liberty Trust to check this green and we were assured this would never be built on and was planned and protected green space. If this is built on this would dramatically change/ ruin our house and devalue it - it would change all the light (all our windows are onto this green) and change/ reduce all our privacy. It would dramatically reduce quality of life around this area and all residents were promised the same so are likely to seek legal recompense.</p> <p>Site 59544: Objection due to this being a conservation area with a historical site (pillar box from the war), it would cause significant harm to local nature and harm to non-listed heritage assets. Preservation order.</p> <p>Site 59547: Objection due to loss of green space, harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservation areas.</p> <p>Site 59630: Objection due to this being a proposed green belt and countryside area, this would harm the aquifer streams, it is outside the confines of the existing development, it would lead to traffic on existing roads and would have an awful visual impact from AONB. It is also a loss of green space - families play out here and families dog walk etc.</p> <p>Site 59631: Objection due to this being existing public open space for residents of Kings Hill, lose of countryside, harm to quiet lanes and rural road networks, it is outside the bounds of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, traffic would be impacted on local roads.</p> <p>Site 59634: Objection die to harm of conservation area, it is mostly ancient woodland, loss of countryside, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59655: Objection due to loss of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59740: Objection due to harm of conservation area, it is a proposed green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic, inadequate resources - KCC indicate suggested school location is not economic as no retail centre.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>Site 59761: Objecting due to loss of ancient woodland (part of site), loss of green belt, loss of countryside, make access to local roads difficult.</p> <p>Site 59797: Objection due to harm of conservation area, loss of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet lane and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59800: Objection due to harm of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59802: Objection due to harm of countryside and green belt area, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59884: Objection as this will change character of area, impact traffic to/from Kings Hill, loss of public open space.</p>	
42442241	Question 8	<p>Site 59424: Reasons for objection: DEFRA forest inventory, ancient woodland and TPO protected trees, over development with inadequate resources in Kings Hill, harm to protected species, outside of confines of existing developments, impact on local residents of main access, impact on wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Site 59531: Reason for objection: this would change the character of the area, it would lead to more traffic to/from Kings Hill centre and through Tower view, we would lose vital public space in Phase 2 - residents walk their dogs here, children play, communities make friends.</p> <p>Site 59534: Reason for objection: this would massively change the character of the area - as you enter Kings Hill down Tower view (one of 2 main entrances) this is the first green space you come to and it's the first green space which makes it look residential rather than like just a business park, it would lead to more traffic to/from Kings Hill centre and local roads which are already overwhelmed from the new development for the over 50+ which does not have enough parking and has massively impacted Hazen Road and Woodford Grove in a negative and dangerous way - coming into Hazen is very unsafe, where would the new road to this development be? If off Tower view it would cause traffic problems and congestion at roundabout, if Hazen or Woodford it would change the nature of these areas - Woodford is a quiet close and this would change this area completely and lead to lots of traffic, we would lose valuable green space - this particular green is where people walk dogs, there are always kids and families playing sports here, in the snow people sledge here, people buy lunches at Waitrose and sit and eat here - you are taking all that away from us. Also Our</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>house is on Woodford on this green - when we bought our house, before buying it we phoned KCC and Liberty Trust to check this green and we were assured this would never be built on and was planned and protected green space. If this is built on this would dramatically change/ ruin our house and devalue it - it would change all the light (all our windows are onto this green) and change/ reduce all our privacy. It would dramatically reduce quality of life around this area and all residents were promised the same so are likely to seek legal recompense.</p> <p>Site 59544: Objection due to this being a conservation area with a historical site (pillar box from the war), it would cause significant harm to local nature and harm to non-listed heritage assets. Preservation order.</p> <p>Site 59547: Objection due to loss of green space, harm to conservation areas and harm to significance of conservation areas.</p> <p>Site 59630: Objection due to this being a proposed green belt and countryside area, this would harm the aquifer streams, it is outside the confines of the existing development, it would lead to traffic on existing roads and would have an awful visual impact from AONB. It is also a loss of green space - families play out here and families dog walk etc.</p> <p>Site 59631: Objection due to this being existing public open space for residents of Kings Hill, lose of countryside, harm to quiet lanes and rural road networks, it is outside the bounds of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, traffic would be impacted on local roads.</p> <p>Site 59634: Objection die to harm of conservation area, it is mostly ancient woodland, loss of countryside, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59655: Objection due to loss of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59740: Objection due to harm of conservation area, it is a proposed green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic, inadequate resources - KCC indicate suggested school location is not economic as no retail centre.</p> <p>Site 59761: Objecting due to loss of ancient woodland (part of site), loss of green belt, loss of countryside, make access to local roads difficult.</p> <p>Site 59797: Objection due to harm of conservation area, loss of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet lane and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59800: Objection due to harm of green belt area, loss of countryside, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59802: Objection due to harm of countryside and green belt area, harm to non-listed heritage assets, harm to aquifer for streams, harm to a quiet and rural area, it is outside of the confines of the existing development, loss of agricultural land, negative impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Site 59884: Objection as this will change character of area, impact traffic to/from Kings Hill, loss of public open space.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42187617	Question 8	Site 59448 and site59450 are green amenity land for residents in the vicinity as are sites that provide parking such as Martin square, where the library needs parking	Comment noted. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Open Space Study
42771457	Question 8	Site 59521 Quincewood Gardens should not be considered for extra housing. This is a green site which is widely used by the local community with children playing there within easy reach of their parents - in order to reach the Woodland Walk play area, the children would need to cross the busy Shipbourne Road. There are also several mature oak trees on this site which are essential to the environment and the local community are able to gain direct access to rural walks without the need to get in cars or cross major roads.	Comment noted. Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Open Space Study
42589025	Question 8	<p>Site 59534, site 59531, and site 59884.</p> <p>We all understand more houses are needed to accommodate growing population, but there are loads of spaces between Kings Hill and East malling or Kings Hill and Waterringbury, these 3 popular small lawn areas are like big back gardens shared among the local residents, building houses on them won't add more weight to building plan, but it will take away relaxing green areas for locals.</p> <p>Especially site 59534, nicknamed by the children 3 hills, has been there for 20 years and is probably the most popular site for generations of children in Kings Hill on snowing winter days because of its shape. Hundreds of children will take sledges to this site to enjoy sliding on the snow. Building 18 houses there will cause more roadside parking and traffic problem on tower view and most importantly will take away the happy spot from the children in Kings Hill! Please don't do it!</p>	Comment noted. Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Open Space Study
42584705	Question 8	<p>Site 59552, 59550, 59571 and 59572 have been identified through the Urban capacity study. They would have minimal impact on the housing needs of the borough but with significant negative impact on all existing residents of the area - removing well used green spaces and Brindles Field playground which is the only playground in this area of the town. They would have negative environmental impact, removing space that could be used as meadowland as currently in some cases.</p> <p>Development on those sites, plus sites 59765, 59641, 59767, 59695 and 59869 would also increase road traffic on the Brook Street/Quarry hill roundabout which is already significantly above capacity at peak times, further impacting on health/wellbeing (in proximity to several schools and a nursery) through idling cars and congestion. It would significantly negatively impact accessibility to services due to increased traffic and current poor provision through buses (for those who cant cycle). Sussex road school already does not serve the needs of the existing housing stock with many residents of the area having to travel elsewhere.</p>	Comment noted. Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Open Space Study
42470209	Question 8	Site 59597 only very small part of this is brownfield majority greenfield grazing and arable. additional housing except on restricted exclusive basis would not have access to schooling facilities. access to main village would cause major and unacceptable traffic flows leading to gridlock. major effect on wildlife and countryside pursuits, road infrastructure would need to be implemented and improved; change of building style used bt developers would impact on heritage and history of area	Comment noted. Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will be preparing evidence including an Open Space Study

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38330945	Question 8	<p>Site 59610 Residential: Park Road Addington – The Parish Council would have no objection to the development of this site subject to an air quality report. The Parish Council has supported previous planning proposals for additional homes on this site. Site 59628 Residential: Millhouse Lane Addington – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site as we feel it would represent overdevelopment in a conservation area. Site 59725 Residential: Ford Lane – The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site. Although we would be concerned about the loss of this site as a leisure facility and the tourism it brings to the area we feel it would be a good site for affordable homes given its proximity to the road network and bus service. There is an ancient woodland to the north of the site which would need to be protected. Site 59850 Mixed Use: East of Addington Village – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We would not welcome the loss of this well-maintained grassland. We feel that any further development in this area would destroy the openness which would be harmful to the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. The proposed entrance to the site is also very narrow and steep and in our opinion not suitable for vehicles. Site 59812 Mixed Use: A20 Clearways Addington – The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site and feel it could work as a mixed-use site. We would welcome affordable housing on this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 59830 Mixed Use: Borough Green Garden City, Borough Green, Wrotham & Platt – The Parish Council is concerned about the fact that Borough Green will lose its identity and be swamped by this development. We are concerned about the effect on the infrastructure and the impact this will have on our village. The proposal would undoubtedly result in an unwelcome increase in traffic and pollution in Addington. We recognise that this site could provide some housing but feel it should be on a smaller scale. 	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.
38330689	Question 8	<p>Site 59610 Residential: Park Road Addington – The Parish Council would have no objection to the development of this site.</p> <p>Site 59628 Residential: Millhouse Lane Addington – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site as we feel it would represent overdevelopment.</p> <p>Site 59725 Residential: Ford Lane – The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site. Although we would be concerned about the loss of this site as a leisure facility and the tourism it brings to the area we feel it would be a good site for affordable homes given its proximity to the road network and bus service.</p> <p>Site 59730 Residential: Addington Lane Trottiscliffe – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We have concerns about more vehicles accessing the road which regularly floods in this area.</p> <p>Site 59736 Mixed Use: Addington Lane, Trottiscliffe – comments as above. Site 59850 Mixed Use: East of Addington Village – The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of this site. We feel that any further development would destroy the openness of this area Site 59812 Mixed Use: A20 Clearways Addington – The Parish Council support the inclusion of this site and feel it could work as a mixed-use site. Site 59830 Mixed Use: Borough Green Garden City, Borough Green, Wrotham & Platt – The Parish Council is concerned about the fact that Borough Green will lose its identity and be swamped by this development. We are concerned about the effect on the infrastructure and the impact this will have on our village. The proposal would undoubtedly result in an unwelcome increase in traffic and pollution in Trottiscliffe which is already used as a rat-run. We recognise that this site could provide some housing but feel it should be on a smaller scale.</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.
42776897	Question 8	<p>Site 59617 & 59703</p> <p>This site is a green belt site outside the village envelope of St Mary's Platt. The access from every direction is wholly inadequate to support any development whatsoever.</p> <p>Due to a lack of car parking for the existing properties in the area, the main access road, Potash Lane, is frequently congested.</p> <p>Any residential development on this site would block the view from, and the view of, our property, The Barn, which is a Listed building. There are number of listed houses in the immediate vicinity and it is a conservation area.</p> <p>In the local plan 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 it is stated that areas of green belt should not be used if at all possible and the heritage sites should be preserved. Therefore this small area should be removed from the list of potential development areas.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746657	Question 8	<p>Site 59641 - fulfils all five criteria of the Greenbelt, currently used for stabling and manege area which is not available anywhere else locally so would be a loss due not only to the facility they provide but the biodiversity associated with the horses.</p> <p>This is agricultural land which should be preserved as such</p> <p>This area is within 250m of a country park the wildlife of which benefits from low levels of light and noise pollution both of which would be threatened by more houses</p> <p>The area is not well served by public transport or local facilities so everyone would have to drive everywhere and the road infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic</p> <p>Sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59641, 59695, 59764,59765, 59869 - all of these will increase the traffic along Brook Street and St. Stephens area to the detriment of the children walking to local schools. There are no ways of expanding routes to these areas so congestion will be significant and to everyones detriment as well as affecting the air quality at the bottom end of the High Street</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42833505	Question 8	<p>Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond, but we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain.</p> <p>Development will irrevocably alter open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities- shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42532353	Question 8	<p>Site 59688- land subject to flooding. Currently used as a leisure (golf) facility.</p> <p>59669- land had previous withdrawn planning application- land subject to flooding, 59679- land subject to flooding, will cause additional risk to flooding in village and further into Stocks Green, Brookmead,Leigh Road and connecting roads.59615- cause additional flooding to that already experienced by residents of Stocks Green. 59692- cause additional flooding to Stocks Green, Brookmead and surrounding areas. 59656- cause additional flooding to Stocks Green, and village.59653- cause additional flooding as above. ALL sites are unsuitable in addition to potential flooding as there is insufficient infrastructure to support the existing population in terms of schools, transport(very heavy traffic), educational and medical support. HMG cannot support the existing community and schools are over subscribed. An additional 1500+homes is unsustainable.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42587169	Question 8	<p>Site 59720 - the proposed plan for 198 dwellings is considerably larger than previous applications (e.g. nursing home, driving range) which were either withdrawn or declined. Any development on this land would need to be of a scale that is consistent with, and addresses, previous planning decisions. KCC recent culling of rural bus services, the increased popularity of white vans delivering home shopping and a road that is already a "rat run" would all drive greater vehicle use, with the consequent negative impact on the environment</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42617505	Question 8	<p>Site 59740 Broadwater Farm.</p> <p>A. This site does not seem suitable for inclusion in the Local Plan going forward given the relatively poor rating against TMBC's Sustainability Assessment criteria.</p> <p>B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of high grade farm land • Harm to many heritage assets including listed buildings, Conservation Area and landscape features • Coalescence of East Malling, West Malling, Kings Hill and nearby hamlets • Harm to the aquifer and lack of consideration of hydrogeology issues • Harm to Quiet Lanes and rural road network • Critical stress on existing road, medical & other infrastructure • The existing consultation for this site elicited over 1,500 objection responses from official consultees, 	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.
42440097	Question 8	<p>Site 59748: this area has no direct road access. Any new road would have to come through residential roads already heavily used and would cause further congestion in the area.</p> <p>The Woodlands Estate is in front of this proposed development and any development would be extremely detrimental to this estate as the main access would probably go through the Reynolds Retreat/Harrison Road exit or Doctor's Surgery/Reynolds Retreat entrance. Traffic would then access the A25 via Quarry Hill Road which is not built to take the traffic already using it.</p> <p>We know from the Hazlebourne development that people will not use the Haul Road down to the A25 Darkhill roundabout, they turn left to use Quarry Hill Road as a short cut.</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.
42803169	Question 8	<p>Site 59758 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Significant impact on borough's landscape and townscape character. should be opposed to preserve agricultural land and prevent urban sprawl/merging of settlements. Site 59759 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Agricultural use should be preserved. Significant impact on borough's landscape and townscape character. Should be opposed to prevent urban sprawl and merging of locales. Site 59760 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Agricultural use should be preserved. Site 59797 - Terrible impact to local setting. No infrastructure or access. Agricultural use should be preserved. Site 59755 - unsafe access to facilities mentioned. Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Site 59757 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Site 59749 - unsafe access to facilities mentioned. Terrible impact to local setting. Site 59750 - No space at school. Impact to greenspace. Site 59752 - Terrible impact to local setting. Agricultural resource should be preserved. Site 59754 - unsafe access to facilities mentioned. Terrible impact to local setting. Site 59425 - access constraints. Disagree with distance to public transport. Site 59594 - significant impact on biodiversity and geodiversity, not uncertain. Significant impact on borough's landscape and townscape character which has heritage value. Site 59597 - no space at school. Hardly brownfield land, huge impact on bio and geodiversity. Site 59598, preserve agricultural land. Site 59861 - preserve agricultural resource. Site 59624 - huge impact on local greenspace. Disagree with distances as realistically site is remote. Site 59631 - as previous. Site 59636 - huge impact on local greenspace. Disagree with distance to station as realistically site is remote. Site 59698 - as previous. Site 59799 - huge impact on local greenspace. Site 59802 - huge impact on local greenspace. Site 59806 - agricultural use should be preserved. Site 59811 - Terrible impact to local setting, wildlife conservation area. No infrastructure or access. Site 59824 - Terrible impact to local setting. No infrastructure or access. Site 59740 - should be opposed to preserve agricultural land and prevent urban</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		sprawl/merging of settlements. Site 59816 - should be opposed to preserve agricultural land and retain local vernacular.	
42802433	Question 8	<p>Site 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to the 'rare crested newts' which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil pipeline enhancements in 2018. The area is also home to deer, hedgehogs, badgers and various raptors which would all see their habitat threatened. Access is extremely poor with single lane sections. There is no pavement for most of this road which is badly lit and is already dangerous for pedestrians. A significant number of mature trees in this area including a number that have preservation orders.</p> <p>The local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) are already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby school and GP surgery and crowded buses at peak times.</p> <p>Tonbridge Road is the main thoroughfare into Tonbridge and is already v. busy at peak times and comes to a complete standstill regularly.</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.
42771649	Question 8	<p>Site 59771</p> <p>This site accessing Coldharbour Lane will place further stress on a road infrastructure that is barely capable of dealing with the current usage. The road is a single track unmarked and unlit road through greenbelt countryside that can not be adapted to handle traffic flow from any of the developed sites. There is already a significant danger to pedestrian users and school children (there is no pavement), which is used daily. The site is of limited size and has previously been identified as being a habitat containing great crested newts which are legally protected. The local infrastructure is at breaking point already and can't cope with more development, esp the schools, GP surgery and busses.</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.
42774081	Question 8	<p>Site 59771</p> <p>This site accessing Coldharbour Lane will put even more stress on the road that is already busy. The road is a single track unmarked and unlit road that goes through greenbelt countryside and cannot be adapted to more traffic as it is. There is already an extreme danger to pedestrians especially children as the road is unpaved. The local area is already struggling with sschools, GP surgeries, busses, etc.</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.
42794721	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 - AONB, opposite a primary school causing extra traffic and congestion at drop off and collection times, next to a dangerous junction along the A227 where cars already break the speed limit.</p> <p>Site 59825 - Green belt, AONB, dangerous narrow access onto back lane and Upper Green Road, open sloping site.</p> <p>Site 59827 - AONB, land drainage and sewer issues on this site. An additional 82 houses, seriously?</p> <p>Shipbourne design statement, edge of conservation area, no mains gas in the village and regular overflowing sewage. Bus service unreliable and lacking.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42739393	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 - this site is both Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB, on the edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. The drainage is poor. The access onto Back Lane is close to the primary school's main access, with a dangerous junction of the A227 and Back Lane. There is an active covenant on this site restricting development, which makes it undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825 - Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB. the site has dangerous access onto Upper Green Road or Back Lane, and there is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>Site 59827 - The site is Green Belt and AONB, and the edge of the Conservation area.</p> <p>Developing these sites would be in conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan, and the Shipbourne Design Statement.</p> <p>The primary school is small and oversubscribed, and the junctions either end of Back Lane experience speeding traffic, with no pavements for pedestrians along the narrow lanes. The bus service is limited to providing a school service for secondary pupils to Tonbridge.</p> <p>There is currently no gas provision in the village.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42715233	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 Green belt and kent downs an area of AONB in the edge of Shipbourne conservation area.</p> <p>Poor drainage to the southern boundary Clay based soil substructure.</p> <p>Access to the Back lane is in close proximity to Shipbourne Primary school, and a danger to school children .</p> <p>Causing congestion at drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>Dangeous junction at back lane with the A227</p> <p>Bus stop on the A227 only supplys a school service.</p> <p>There is an active covenant on this land resticting developement it is therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825</p> <p>Green belt and kent downs an area of AONB is the edge of Shipbourne conservation area</p> <p>Very open site</p> <p>Dangerous access to Upper Green Rd or to Back lane</p> <p>Proposed mixed developementon this site is questionable there is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne .</p> <p>Site 59827</p> <p>Green belt and kent downs an area of AONB id the edge of conservation area</p> <p>There are land drainage issues on this site and a water course runs along the southern boundary,</p> <p>There are already issues with sewer overflows across the site.</p> <p>Common to all three Sites</p> <p>All three sites are in the green belt and the kent AONB, if any of these sites were developed they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with kent downs AONB management plan which gives advice "on how to conserve and enhance natural beauty ".In accordance witht the countryside and rights of way(crow)act 2000.</p> <p>Shipbourne conservation area and the adopted shipbourne design statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vunerable Shipbourne is to developement.</p> <p>All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to current policies covering conservationand enhancement of the AONB village in th GB. Any of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village, which has no services other than the small primary school already over subscribed.The juctions at both ends of Back lane are dangerous, Back lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through from the A228/A26-to the A227, and cross country to the A21.The bus stiop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times.The village is not on the Gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developement in these sites.Sewage is also under pressuer and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on 598277 provision of water; current systems are inadequate to accomodate new developement.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42633313	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 Green belt and Kent Downs AONB. Edge of Shipbourne Conservation area. Drainage poor southern boundary. Access to Back Lane very near to Shipbourne Primary School and Children's day care and Nursery comprising two buildings. Danger to all children and will add to the congestion at drop of and pick up times. Dangerous junction with Back Lane and the 227. There is a bus stop which only provides a school service. Most buses have been removed from service. Active covenant on land restricting development. Undeliverable. Site 59825 Green belt and Kent Downs AONB. Within Shipbourne Conservation area. Very open site. Dangerous access onto Upper Green Road or Back Lane both of which are narrow country roads. Backs onto a listed building. Will adversely affect the aspect of the building and garden. Site 59827 Green belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the conservation area. Land drainage issues on the site and there's is a watercourse on the southern boundary. There are issues with sewer overflow across the site. Comments pertinent to all three sites: All sites are in Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB. If development happens on any one of the sites they would be in conflict with GB policy and with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which advises on how "to conserve and enhance natural beauty" in accordance with the Countryside And Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. Shipbourne is also a conservations area and has a Design Statement which sets out what is special and important to Shipbourne and how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. All three sites are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the GB. The development of any one of these sites would have a huge, and irreparable, impact of the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than a very small and oversubscribed primary school on a site not lending itself to school expansion. The junctions at each end of Back Lane are dangerous with speeding traffic; it is used as a cut through from the A228/A26 to the A227 and cross country to the A21. All roads other than the A227 are small country lanes which are not suitable for high levels of traffic which development of the sites would result in. The bus stops mentioned in relation to Site 59779 and 59825 are only used in the morning at school time. Most school bus services to the village have been cut. The village is not on the gas network and the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new development. Sewerage is under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on Site 59827. A sewer manhole on Back Lane has overflowed twice in recent months. Provision of water. Current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development Walkers come, in cars, on weekends and in the summer months to enjoy the AONB. The volume of cars causes parking and traffic problems. Any further development would exacerbate this problem. There are no safe options to commute to and from Shipbourne other than by car and a scant bus service. An increased volume of cars would destroy the green belt and AONB.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42726689	Question 8	<p>Site 59779 Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation area. Poor draining on southern boundary. Access on to Back Lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary School. Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. Dangerous junction of Back Lane with A227. Bus stop on A227 currently only provides a school service. There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825 Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. Very open site. Dangerous axes onto narrow Upper Green Road or onto Back Lane Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>Site 59827 Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB & the edge of conservation area. There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.</p> <p>Common to all 3 sites: All 3 sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed they would be in conflict with GB policy & conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how to conserve & enhance natural beauty in accordance with the Countryside & Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. Shipbourne Conservation area & the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. All 3 are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the GB. Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than a small primary school, already oversubscribed. The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26 - to A227 and cross country to the A21 The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827 Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42615969	Question 8	<p>Site 59779:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Poor drainage on southern boundary. • Access onto Back lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school and also a nursery which my daughter attends. <p>Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times.</p> <p>Site 59825:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. • There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. • There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site. <p>Common to all three sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how “to conserve and enhance natural beauty” in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. • Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. • All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the GB. Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary School, already oversubscribed. • The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26- to A227 and cross country to the A21 • The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times. • The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. • Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. • Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42719329	Question 8	<p>Site 59779:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Poor drainage on southern boundary. • Access onto Back lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. • Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227. • Bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. • There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable. Site 59825: • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59825:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. • There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. • There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site. <p>Common to all three sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how “to conserve and enhance natural beauty” in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. • Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. • All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the GB. Any one of these sites would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character of this small village which has no services other than the small primary School, which is already oversubscribed. • The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26- to A227 and cross country to the A21 • The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times. • The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. • Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. • Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42800449	Question 8	<p>Site 59779:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Poor drainage on southern boundary. • Access onto Back Lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. • Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227. • Bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. • There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable. <p>Site 59825:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. • Very open site. • Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne. <p>Site 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. • There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. • There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site. <p>Common to all three sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how “to conserve and enhance natural beauty” in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. • Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. • All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the GB. Any one of these sites would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character of this small village which has no services other than the small primary School, which is already oversubscribed. • The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to from the A228/A26- to A227 and cross country to the A21. • The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times. • The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. • Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. • Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42616097	Question 8	<p>Site 59779: Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. Poor Drainage on southern boundary. Access onto Back lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. Danger to school children and parents and congestion at pick up and drop off times. Back up of traffic on Back Lane causing congestion and hence danger on main road A227 and crossroad. Bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825: Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB, within the Shipbourne Conservation area. Very open site. Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne</p> <p>Site 59827: Green Belt, Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the Conservation area. There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.</p> <p>Common to all three sites: All three sites are in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how "to conserve and enhance natural beauty" in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. Shipbourne Conservation Area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne residents and its many visitors and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in GB. Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary school, already oversubscribed. The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to and from the A228/A26- A227 and cross country to the A21. The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times. The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites. Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. New street lighting would cause light pollution to an area currently not blighted. There would be a great increase in traffic in order to access primary services not currently available in the village.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42744961	Question 8	<p>Site 59779: Is in Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. There is poor drainage on the southern boundary. Access onto Back Lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary School. There is danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times. There is a dangerous junction at Back Lane with the A227. The bus stop on the A227 currently only provides a school service. There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>Site 59825:Shipbourne Conservation Area. It is a very open site. There would be dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road or onto Back Lane. Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>All three are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the Green Belt. Any one of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary school which is already oversubscribed.</p> <p>The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous ad Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to and from the A228/A26 to the A227 and cross country to the A21.</p> <p>The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times.</p> <p>The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments in these sites.</p> <p>Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827.</p> <p>Provision of water: current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development.</p> <p>Site 59827: Is in the Green Belt and Kent Downs AONB and is on the edge of the Conservation Area. There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary, There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42637633	Question 8	<p>Site 59779: Is in the Green Belt and an AONB. and on the edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. There is poor drainage on the southern boundary. Access onto Back Lane is in close proximity to the main access to Shipbourne Primary School. A potentially extremely dangerous situation. The bus stop on the A227 provides only a school service. There is an active covenant on this land restricting development.</p> <p>Site 59825: This site is in Green Belt, in the Kent Downs AONB and within the Shipbourne Conservation area. It is a very open site with dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road or onto Back Lane. Proposal for mixed development on this site is questionable as there is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.</p> <p>Site 59827: This site is in Green Belt, in the Kent Downs AONB and on the edge of the Conservation Area. There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary. There are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.</p> <p>COMMON TO ALL THREE SITES IN ADDITION TO ABOVE: If any of these sites were developed they would be in conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan and the Green Belt policy which gives advice on how "to conserve and enhance natural beauty" in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000.</p> <p>Shipbourne Conservation area and the adopted Shipbourne Design Statement set out what is special and important to Shipbourne and clearly indicate how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development.</p> <p>All three proposals are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB Village in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Any of these sites would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than the small primary school, already oversubscribed.</p> <p>The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a cut through to and from the A228/A26 to the A227 and cross country to the A21.</p> <p>The bus stop mentioned in relation to site 59779 is only used at school times.</p> <p>The village is not on the gas network so the current electricity grid would need upgrading to sustain any new developments on these sites.</p> <p>Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827</p> <p>The current systems are inadequate in the provision of water to accommodate new development.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42608993	Question 8	<p>Site 59779: This site lies within the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB. It is also very close to the Shipbourne Conservation Area. It is very close to Shipbourne Primary School and the dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227.</p> <p>Site 59825: The site lies within the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB and is close to the Shipbourne Conservation Area. The site is very open and access onto Upper Green Road or Back Lane would be problematic.</p> <p>Site 59827: The site lies within the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB and is close to the Shipbourne Conservation Area. There are drainage issues associated with this site.</p> <p>Common to all sites: All three sites have Green Belt and AONB protection and are unsustainable and undeliverable unless big changes are made to current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this small village. Shipbourne is also lacking in services and amenities save for the oversubscribed primary school. Existing electricity, water and sewerage provision are already under pressure and new developments on these sites would require significant upgrades in infrastructure.</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.
45652801	Question 8	<p>Site 59797 - loss of golf course Site 59800 - loss of wildlife, loss of agricultural land, historic woodland adjacent to site, increased traffic on A228/A26</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42771361	Question 8	<p>Site 59797 / Site 59800 - The golf course provides local and nearby residents with a valued and much used sporting amenity. It also provides valuable employment opportunities. The development of houses on some of the golf course land will almost certainly result in the closure of the facility.</p> <p>It will also have a negative impact on the local wildlife and reduce the number of public footpaths and bridle ways.</p> <p>Site 59799 - Wateringbury is classified as a “rural settlement” and is within the green belt. The existing roads and facilities struggle to cope with existing volumes and it should not, therefore, be considered for the development of further housing. Please don’t ruin our village any further!</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.
42719361	Question 8	<p>Site 59799: Green belt and AONB Access close to Shipbourne Primary School - danger to children Dangerous junction Site 59825: Green Belt and AONB Dangerous access to upper green road and back lane No identifiable need for social housing In Shipbourne</p> <p>Common issues: Green belt and AONB Conservation area Unsustainable and undeliverable No services- small primary school already oversubscribed</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42443169	Question 8	<p>Site 59800: this site is part of the green belt and forms part of a nature conservation area and borders ancient woodland, impacting on the bio diversity of the area. The development would result in the loss of a local facility ie the golf course, having a detrimental impact on local employment and the health of the local residences. Egress from this site can only be back into restrictive roads within Kings Hill or detrimentally impacting the quiet lane of Cannon Lane which itself egresses onto the busy A26 at a blind corner. This is also a site of aquifers and streams and within the last 12 months has suffered from a sinkhole.</p> <p>Site 59797: this site is part of the green belt and forms part of a nature conservation area and borders ancient woodland, impacting on the bio diversity of the area. The development would result in the loss of a local facility ie the golf course, having a detrimental impact on local employment and the health of the local residences. This area provides access to the countryside and has a number of public rights of way that were maintain when the golf course was established. This would represent a loss of amenity not just to local golfers but also walkers and dog walkers. It is heavily patronised by the local residences and would. We would lose agricultural land into the bargain when we are aware we need to be more resilient in our food availability, This is a substantial development and would place damaging impact on already stretch health services in the area as well as the local infrastructure.</p> <p>Site 59761: this would result in the loss of ancient woodland, canopy cover and open space impacting on wildlife. This would result in the loss of a rural business and employment. The local infrastructure in the form of the A228 would be adversely impacted which is already under pressure and subject to change to improve the safety of the road in this area owing to the volume of traffic.</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.
42717377	Question 8	Site 59808 (to the north of Woodfield Avenue) is in the Green Belt and must not be developed. Furthermore, developing this site would have dramatic, life-changing effect on the residents of Woodfield Avenue. It is currently a place chosen by people who value tranquil, close-to-nature living. Attempts to turn it into a build site for 222 new homes will be met with strong protests, court filings, FOI-based investigations, and all other available resources.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42719233	Question 8	Site 59808 Any extra housing developments around Woodfield avenue will dramatically impact to the noise and pollution level, reduce price of the current houses due to changing from "close-to-nature" and "cul-de-sac" status to properties on "through road".	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42733441	Question 8	Site 59811 development would not promote health and wellness, the area is hugely scenic and extensively used by walkers and others. The site is bounded by three very narrow roads, non of which could support the traffic associated with up to 2000 new homes.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42832577	Question 8	<p>SITE 59811</p> <p>1. Current Policy as stated by the PM Rishi Sunak does not support building in the Green Belt but should make use of other existing space,</p> <p>2. This site extends significantly outside the developed area of the village of Hadlow across great swathes of PURE green belt far from the RSA which as previously indicated is rather deceptive on the plan,</p> <p>3. The site will merge Parishes of Hadlow and the smaller village of West Peckham without any division .</p> <p>4. The site has no existing suitable infrastructure therefore all its creation will be damaging for the environment. No suitable access roads or direct access to any major roads . Will cause dangerous overloading of small country lanes No paving or other pedestrian infrastructure. The economics will also be less viable than that of alternative more urban development ,</p> <p>5. The area suffers from significant water flash flooding ,as water from the higher hills drains down together with the geological makeup of the ground conditions . This is evident by the continual streams of water than can flow in Oxenhoath road and also across the fields to Common Road .</p> <p>6. Future Water Management Issues. Given that the ground already cannot absorb all the water in wetter months if extensive hard surfacing is added over much of the land this will become a significant problem to manage.</p> <p>7. The site encroaches into the Heritage and Cultural Parkland area of Oxenhoath with its magnificent Grade 11* Manor house , walled gardens and 140 acres, ensteeped in history . The development will have significant negative impact on the a much larger area of the heritage English rural landscape.</p> <p>8. The rolling landscape of rural farmland , established hedgerows, significant oaks (TPO's present) and other native trees , Fauna and flora . A special habitat for biodiversity that a wide variety of Wildlife is home to , many birds of prey (Sparrow Hawks , Owls) and host of other bird life. Mammals from small weasels ,Bats , Stoats Hairs, Badgers , Foxes . The lake has its own diversity of waterlife from amphibians (including variety of newts), snakes , fish and variety of insect life , the whole system being a balanced ecosystem that will be irreparably damaged.</p> <p>9. The area is actively farmed with very fertile arable and pasture land with established dairy herd and variety of rotated crops .It's size is economic for farming activity as opposed to some other areas. (I state this as a son of a farming family) and Destruction of this resource will not only remove more agricultural land but damage the aforementioned ecosystem. It will also remove local food production.</p> <p>10. The area is crossed by footpaths and used extensively by hikers and walkers allowing them to easily access the health benefits in body and mind in such a picturesque tranquil environment.</p> <p>For all the above reasons development in Option 4 is unsuitable and damaging given the alternatives.</p>	<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.</p>
42833985	Question 8	<p>Site 59811</p> <p>Development of this site would eradicate an ANOB. There are also listed grazing sites on this plot.</p> <p>The local roads cannot accommodate this. Roughway lane would become a main thoroughfare to Sevenoaks - it struggles with minimal traffic when local road closures are put in place. Local villages would be lost in a vast conurbation.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42760065	Question 8	<p>Site 59811</p> <p>This site is predominantly agricultural and green belt, and wholly unsuitable for large scale housing development. There is no mains drainage, no public transport and no roads suitable for the number of vehicles that would be generated by a large residential development</p> <p>The only school near this site is at Plaxtol, and the narrow lanes are blocked at the beginning and end of the school day. There are only two small village shops.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42723137	Question 8	<p>Site 59825</p> <p>In keeping with the government's emphasis on walking and cycling rather than car usage my wife and I regularly walk (and I cycle) along Upper Green Road and Back Lane.</p> <p>At most times of day, and most days, the current volume and speed of traffic along both these road, and Back Lane particularly, makes walking quite challenging, with constant need to take action to avoid vehicles, which otherwise pass dangerously close to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Vehicles include vans on most days, and heavy lorries and farm machinery on weekdays.</p> <p>When vehicles, often travelling quite fast, need to pass each other that is simply impossible if any pedestrian or cyclist is in the road, although they do sometimes try.</p> <p>This proposed site would increase the amount of traffic and provide potentially dangerous access onto Upper Green Road and Back Lane, making the use of Upper Green Road and Back Lane even less viable than now for pedestrians living in an area of outstanding natural beauty within the Shipbourne Conservation Area and seeking to enjoy that situation without undue risk.</p> <p>Additionally walking that essentially rural route would become far less attractive if the proposed development were implemented, so we would just use our cars, further increasing the traffic!</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42616897	Question 8	<p>Site 59827 (and adjacent sites 59825 and 59779)</p> <p>All in the Green Belt and AONB area and adjacent to the Shipbourne Conservation area. Watercourses run along the southern and eastern boundaries and floods regularly occur. The ground is predominantly clay and often waterlogged. The local sewerage pumping station is already struggling to cope. Back-flow of surface water and effluent over my driveway and garden (which is adjacent to Site 59827) occurs at times after heavy rain due to the inadequate capacity of the pumping system currently in place. (It happened today 3/11/22 just to prove the point!)</p> <p>As it is, the sewer/drainage system requires significant improvement to accommodate outflow from potentially 30 more people occupying three sites already approved along Back Lane/Reeds Lane. Unfortunately, there has been no acknowledgement of this need for an improvement in the equipment despite my objection during the planning process. If any further development should take place on any of these adjacent sites a major upgrade of facilities would be needed.</p> <p>Adding more traffic to these narrow local roads would significantly increase the likelihood of accidents and injuries. It would also completely change the character of Shipbourne as a desirable, picturesque rural asset.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42728897	Question 8	<p>Site 59827</p> <p>This site is in the centre of the village and within Shipbourne Conservation Area, Greenbelt & AONB. It contributes openness to this village of sporadic housing with some of historic value overlooking the site. Access to the site via back Lane or Upper Green Lane would be dangerous as both roads narrow. Assumed "mixed use" means private and social housing. In the latter case unlikely this is needed to any degree as attempts were made some years ago to determine the need, but interest evaporated when lack of bus services, shop and gas were realised.</p> <p>Site 59827</p> <p>This site is Greenbelt, AONB, Kent Downs and abuts the Conservation Area. The proposed development of this site (82 houses) would transform this village of mainly sporadic housing built over the centuries. Extra services would be needed let alone gas which is not available in the village. Access to Back Lane or Reeds lane is not viable as too dangerous unless major road works undertaken. The site has been used for rotation of crops on this fertile 3/3A grade land for as long as living memory. The site falls to a wide stream , gets waterlogged at intervals and prone to flooding from sewerage passing to pumping station. It is noted that minor, negligible, negative comments are regularly made in the Sustainability Appraisal .</p> <p>Site 59779</p> <p>Again Greenbelt, AONB and edge of Conservation Area. Access is very poor and dangerous unless major roadworks carried out. Drainage poor with stream to southern boundary. Back Lane very narrow and rat run with school parking and pickups giving congestion. Junction to A227 is already difficult.</p> <p>Apart from the above objections Shipbourne Village has a Village Plan of long standing and the above 3 development proposals undermine this to such a degree that a document which has helped to preserve this picturesque village will be ignored in the future if any or all the proposals are granted inclusion in the final approved plan. Finally the village has virtually no facilities, no shop, no gas, poor Wi Fi and hardly any bus service.</p>	<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.</p>
42776417	Question 8	<p>Site 59845</p> <p>This site is in the Green Belt and comprises grade 1 Agricultural Land. For these reasons alone it is clearly unsuitable for development. It is an important open space for Watringbury village allowing views down to the River Medway. It is also the only 'break' in development between Watringbury and Teston in the neighbouring borough. The A26 is an extremely busy road with much congestion, noise and emissions at the Watringbury crossroads. A housing development on this site will exacerbate this traffic problem.</p> <p>Site 59803</p> <p>This site is also in the Green Belt and comprises grade 1 Agricultural Land. It is therefore unsuitable for development. It provides a break in development between Watringbury and Teston in the neighbouring borough. The A26 and Red Hill are extremely busy roads with much congestion, noise and emissions, especially at the Watringbury crossroads. A housing development of the scale envisaged will exacerbate this traffic problem.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42654465	Question 8	<p>SITE 59861</p> <p>This site, while seeming very attractive at first glance providing as it does the potential to meet neatly 10% of the OAN, will be untenable locally. The only two exits would be either onto Hermitage Lane and/or onto Kiln Barn Road. Hermitage Lane is already congested in busy periods and the addition of an additional 2000 cars on top of those already using it and those to be built under applications already approved will make the road a major traffic hot spot for most of the day. This road is also the road that leads to Maidstone Hospital and will result in further delays to A&E admissions and missed appointments. Kiln Barn Road exits onto the A20 at Ditton Corner and already suffers congestion at busy times and this will be made worse when the Orchard Mill development is built out. Kiln Barn Road also leads to Watlingbury Road via Easterfields and Sweets Lane - both single track lanes will limited passing spaces.</p>	<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.</p>
42744641	Question 8	<p>SITE IDS: 59813, 59639, 59640, 59753 and 59782</p> <p>All the above sites are unsuitable for development due to i) very poor accessibility; ii) sites in flood zones 2 and 3; iii) roads to the sites flood; iv) sites can be isolated from the village services in times of flooding; v) high ground water means the use of soak aways is unlikely to be suitable/sustainable for this area; vi) sites on greenbelt land; vii) surface water discharge from 59813 in particular could flood property downstream; viii) building on site 59813 contradicts anti-coalescence and the hamlet of Hale Street should be kept from the hamlet of East Peckham; ix) CLH fuel pipeline goes through 59813; x) no railway station close by; xi) closest railway station is not a mainline station, has no parking and has no direct routes to London; xii) closest railway station has no lighting or pavement on the roads leading to it and the roads flood; xiii) there is no GP surgery in the village (the NHS refused to continue funding it so it closed down) Yalding or Paddock Wood are the closest GP surgeries.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of these sites are on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. For food security reasons - we must not build on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. Once it is lost, it is lost. - there is an animal sanctuary nearby; - there is an ancient pilgrimage trail passing through; - Bush Road is narrow, unlit and with no pavements - light pollution will ensue from development destroying the natural darkness; <p>The village of East Peckham should be downgraded from a Rural Service Centre to a Rural Settlement.</p>	<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.</p>
42721729	Question 8	<p>Site no: 59789</p> <p>Ancient Agricultural land Flood risk due to natural stream Area has limited services (GP, train station and limited bus services) Limited site accessibility Site is in a flood zone Limited access to mains services such as cable</p> <p>Removal of such green space would change the current residents and villagers air quality, sound and natural light.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42489889	Question 8	<p>Site Numbers 59799/59624/59623.</p> <p>the above sites shown are all adjoining or on green belt land and conservation areas.</p> <p>in rural area on very narrow country lanes with residential properties all adjoining the proposed sites.</p> <p>all to properties get there power supplies from overhead power supplies as well as telephones and internet.</p> <p>59624 shows 185 proposed dwellings that,s possibly 370 vehicles @ 2 per property on already over crowded country lanes with out sites 59799 and 59623.</p> <p>all this is proposed on agricultural land and with the government of the day telling everyone the we must be self sufficient in growing our own produce and be able to cut costs.</p> <p>Once again this plan is looking more and more of being put together by people other than the local people of the parishes that know their local areas better than anyone.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42414401	Question 8	<p>Site Ref 59534 Tower View, Kings Hill</p> <p>This was designated as protected land when houses were originally built by Liberty Property and house builders.</p> <p>It is the only landing place for the Kent Air Ambulance on the few occasions it has been required on Kings Hill - both residential and for the only shops on the hill. This is a critical service that should not become inaccessible.</p> <p>There is no other green space nearby.</p> <p>It is a very small but vital part of the community and is much valued by residents and their pets. There is no other natural environment close by to attract wildlife.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42602529	Question 8	<p>Site Ref 59779 Close to dangerous cross-roads and School. Dangerous for school children.</p> <p>Site Ref 59827 On agricultural land in greenbelt area. Access on to lane leading to Primary School which is narrow and becomes very congested at school opening and closing times. Infrastructure needed for this to be developed would be significant and costly.</p> <p>Site Ref 59825 Close to Shipbourne Conservation Area. Above comments on infrastructure and congestion also apply.</p> <p>Lack of public transport will add to car congestion.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42807937	Question 8	<p>SITE REF 59830 BOROUGH GREEN</p> <p>This site is too big. It takes up too much land. It is too close to already established housing estates. It borders an AONB and environmentally sensitive area. The infrastructure is already under pressure and whilst the ideals of what the Plan may bring the cost involved in disruption to the existing population and landscape is too high.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42780929	Question 8	<p>Site ref: 59596 the land to the south of the site now benefits from planning permission for 7no. dwellings. This approved development now sets a precedent for the bringing forward of this site for development. The site would be able to deliver up to 10 units, within what has been demonstrated as a sustainable site with an already approved access.</p> <p>Good quality development is achievable within the site as high quality designed buildings would be deliverable.</p> <p>Careful, landscape led design, would allow the surrounding rural countryside to be protected and respected, with the layout responding positively to the sites context.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42035937	Question 8	<p>Site ref: 59791, 59792, 59787, 59818, 59784, 59819</p> <p>The high concentration of potential sites within the Aylesford and North Downs Ward is unacceptable due to the inadequacy of it's infrastructure, lack of public transport, medical facilities and local schools. In almost all of these potential sites, the only road in and out of the villages is the totally inadequate and dangerous dual carriageway on Rochester Road.</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.
42640129	Question 8	<p>Site Reference 59825. Any development on this site will have a detrimental affect on the setting of my heritage site/listed building and it will completely change the character. This has not been appreciated in the Sustainable Assessment. There is a direct line of sight between my heritage asset and the development site. My heritage asset is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and a Conservation Area and within Green Belt.</p> <p>Site Reference 59827, 59779, 59825. All 3 sites are designated in the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. All 3 sites are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village in the GB. Any development would have a huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which is in a conservation area. It has no services other than a school which is already oversubscribed. Traffic passing through the village is already very dangerous. The village does not have the infrastructure, there is no gas so electricity would need upgrading to sustain new development. Sewage is under pressure and current water systems are inadequate to accommodate new development. Any development would mean the developer would have to make costly extra provision for these services. Site 59779 access onto Back Lane is too close to the access to Shipbourne school and could be danger to school children. Dangerous junction with A227. Site 59825 dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road or onto Back Lane. Proposed mixed development is questionable. This site is in the line of sight of a Heritage Asset and will have a detrimental affect on the setting of this property. Site 59827 already land drainage issues on this site and sewage overflow.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42720513	Question 8	<p>Site reference nos: 59750, 59749, 59599, 59597, 59752, 59816, 59598, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59758, 59754, 59757, 59761.</p> <p>I have profound and well-founded objections to the proposals made for possible development sites within the village and its environs.</p> <p>The majority of the village is sited between the B2016, Seven Mile Lane and the A228, Malling Road. These roads are connected via The Street to the south (north of St. Lawrence's church) and to the north by Beech Road. All these roads have significant problems caused by traffic are not fit to cope with an increase in traffic volume.</p> <p>Any developments which increase the burden placed on these roads will seriously exacerbate congestion to a busy and dangerously narrow to the main north/south road for mid Kent. The parking problems caused in The Street, not only by Mereworth Primary School, have been ongoing for many years. The Street is regularly brought to a standstill twice a day, on one occasion in 2022 poor parking resulted in a delay of almost three hours.</p> <p>The infrastructure supporting the existing settlements in this area are woefully inadequate and over-stretched. During 2022 there were water shortages and drainage problems in Mereworth and the surrounding area. There are also semi regular power cuts, the reasons for which are unclear, but these would surely become exacerbated with further properties. Broadband coverage is also a problem with phone and internet speeds effected. This is an ongoing problem not even resolved on large residential estates in the area.</p> <p>There is a serious problem with the existing medical practice, covering Kings Hill, West Malling, Offham, West Peckham, Mereworth, Leybourne and the scattered dwellings in between. It is difficult to even get through to the GP practise by phone and virtually impossible to see a GP in person. Dentistry is no better served with no NHS dentists in the area having vacancies. The two hospitals serving the community, Maidstone and Pembury are also overstretched as is, from personal experience, the ambulance service.</p> <p>There are no secondary schools in the area which are accessible on foot requiring children to travel many miles by school bus and the very limited public transport service. In addition I believe the primary school in Mereworth is already oversubscribed and would not be able to accommodate even a fraction of children within the residential development suggested.</p> <p>Public transport from Mereworth is inadequate. Although a bus service does run to and from Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells it is, again from personal experience, infrequent and unreliable. There is no train station within walking distance, the nearest requiring a bus to get there. This is a problem for those without their own transport needing to get to places of employment and to shops, post offices etc. as Mereworth does not have such facilities.</p> <p>Sites for over 8000 dwellings are proposed for the wider Mereworth area; many of which are neither appropriate or feasible. The ingress and egress to these sites often involves single track lanes onto fast and/or congested roads which even without additional dwellings at present struggle to cope with the current levels of traffic. Breakdowns and shunts on the A228 and B2016 cause long delays and block the narrow village roads.</p> <p>It seems that only one of the sites identified appears to be on a brown field location, but even this is tenuous, the others being situated on green field and woodland. The development of these sites would greatly affect wildlife and biodiversity within the area. Several of the sites identified are also within flood zones and are presently used as agricultural land.</p> <p>Development sites under the present proposals would very effectively wipe out the village character of Mereworth, in some aspects becoming an extension to Kings Hill. The village was in the Domesday Book and has sites of significant</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>historical importance (Mereworth Castle, Yotes Court, St Lawrence Church, Brewers Hall, the old vicarage and many original houses in their original settings with surrounding land). Its total destruction as a cohesive community would, if only a small proportion of the proposed sites are agreed, be guaranteed. TMBC has a duty surely to not only meet planning requirements but to ensure the continued existence and protect the quality of life of existing settlements.</p>	
42734305	Question 8	<p>Site reference nos: 59750, 59749, 59599, 59597, 59752, 59816, 59598, 59759, 59760, 59755, 59758, 59754, 59757, 59761.</p> <p>I have profound and well-founded objections to the proposals made for possible development sites within the village and its environs.</p> <p>The majority of the village is sited between the B2016, Seven Mile Lane and the A228, Malling Road. These roads are connected via The Street to the south (north of St. Lawrence's church) and to the north by Beech Road. All these roads have significant problems caused by traffic are not fit to cope with an increase in traffic volume.</p> <p>Any developments which increase the burden placed on these roads will seriously exacerbate congestion to a busy and dangerously narrow to the main north/south road for mid Kent. The parking problems caused in The Street, not only by Mereworth Primary School, have been ongoing for many years. The Street is regularly brought to a standstill twice a day, on one occasion in 2022 poor parking resulted in a delay of almost three hours.</p> <p>The infrastructure supporting the existing settlements in this area are woefully inadequate and over-stretched. During 2022 there were water shortages and drainage problems in Mereworth and the surrounding area. There are also semi regular power cuts, the reasons for which are unclear, but these would surely become exacerbated with further</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>properties. Broadband coverage is also a problem with phone and internet speeds effected. This is an ongoing problem not even resolved on large residential estates in the area.</p> <p>There is a serious problem with the existing medical practice, covering Kings Hill, West Malling, Offham, West Peckham, Mereworth, Leybourne and the scattered dwellings in between. It is difficult to even get through to the GP practise by phone and virtually impossible to see a GP in person. Dentistry is no better served with no NHS dentists in the area having vacancies. The two hospitals serving the community, Maidstone and Pembury are also overstretched as is, from personal experience, the ambulance service.</p> <p>There are no secondary schools in the area which are accessible on foot requiring children to travel many miles by school bus and the very limited public transport service. In addition I believe the primary school in Mereworth is already oversubscribed and would not be able to accommodate even a fraction of children within the residential development suggested.</p> <p>Public transport from Mereworth is inadequate. Although a bus service does run to and from Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells it is, again from personal experience, infrequent and unreliable. There is no train station within walking distance, the nearest requiring a bus to get there. This is a problem for those without their own transport needing to get to places of employment and to shops, post offices etc. as Mereworth does not have such facilities.</p> <p>Sites for over 8000 dwellings are proposed for the wider Mereworth area; many of which are neither appropriate or feasible. The ingress and egress to these sites often involves single track lanes onto fast and/or congested roads which even without additional dwellings at present struggle to cope with the current levels of traffic. Breakdowns and shunts on the A228 and B2016 cause long delays and block the narrow village roads.</p> <p>It seems that only one of the sites identified appears to be on a brown field location, but even this is tenuous, the others being situated on green field and woodland. The development of these sites would greatly affect wildlife and biodiversity within the area. Several of the sites identified are also within flood zones and are presently used as agricultural land.</p> <p>Development sites under the present proposals would very effectively wipe out the village character of Mereworth, in some aspects becoming an extension of Kings Hill. The village was in the Domesday Book and has sites of significant historical importance (Mereworth Castle, Yotes Court, St Lawrence Church, Brewers Hall, the old vicarage and many original houses in their original settings with surrounding land). Its total destruction as a cohesive community would, if only a small proportion of the proposed sites are agreed, be guaranteed. TMBC has a duty surely to not only meet planning requirements but to ensure the continued existence and protect the quality of life of existing settlements.</p>	
42771937	Question 8	<p>Site reference number 59797 and 59800 - It will result in a loss of recreational facilities for residents, will cost jobs with the loss of a golf course which is also crucial to wildlife. There is historic woodland in the area and the area is in green belt land. I understand that the development at Kings Hill was based on 40% remaining as green space and the golf course was an agreed amenity within that development. The loss of recreational space and increase in pollution will have a detrimental effect to the health of local residents.</p> <p>Site reference number 59799 - This area forms part of the green belt land and it would be an absolute travesty to turn this area into a building site. The roads cannot cope with the resulting increase in traffic, which would pass through surrounding rural settlements, impacting the residents' quality of life. Wildlife would be pushed out and people will lose vital space for walking and enjoying the countryside and pollution will increase.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723713	Question 8	<p>Site: 59592</p> <p>We live adjacent to this land and, up until recently, took care of it as leaseholders, and wanted to update some of the appraisal findings. The main points relate to protection of the biodiversity and flood risks associated with the site.</p> <p>This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains protected species of newt.</p> <p>The clay like soil and run-off from land up-hill results in a lot of water running through the land and collecting in the lake. During peak periods of rain, the run-off from the lake and the land ends up on Tonbridge Road, overwhelming the drainage and contributing to the flooding of the lower lying areas like Brookmead.</p> <p>This land is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes.</p> <p>There are also many large mature trees and wooded areas that provide a habitat for the wildlife and act as a barrier for the water run-off from the fields above.</p> <p>The local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) are already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby school and GP surgery and crowded buses at peak times.</p> <p>Tonbridge Road is the main thoroughfare into Tonbridge and is already v. busy at peak times and comes to a complete standstill regularly.</p> <p>Site: 59808</p> <p>We also live adjacent to this land. Most of the points above apply to this land as well (it has a water body and lots of water run-off, as well as mature trees supporting biodiversity and the same lack of capacity in local infrastructure) but it also has public footpaths and is used by a lot of Hildenborough and Tonbridge residents for good health and well-being, particularly dog walkers, and this has increased markedly over recent years. This green area would be a considerable loss were it to be developed.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746561	Question 8	<p>Site: 59592</p> <p>We live adjacent to this land and, up until recently, took care of it as leaseholders, and wanted to update some of the appraisal findings. The main points relate to protection of the biodiversity and flood risks associated with the site.</p> <p>This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains protected species of newt. The clay like soil and run-off from land up-hill results in a lot of water running through the land and collecting in the lake. During peak periods of rain, the run-off from the lake and the land ends up on Tonbridge Road, overwhelming the drainage and contributing to the flooding of the lower lying areas like Brookmead.</p> <p>This land is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes.</p> <p>There are also many large mature trees and wooded areas that provide a habitat for the wildlife and act as a barrier for the water run-off from the fields above.</p> <p>The local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) are already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby school and GP surgery and crowded buses at peak times.</p> <p>Tonbridge Road is the main thoroughfare into Tonbridge and is already v. busy at peak times and comes to a complete standstill regularly.</p> <p>Site: 59808</p> <p>We also live adjacent to this land. Most of the points above apply to this land as well (it has a water body and lots of water run-off, as well as mature trees supporting biodiversity and the same lack of capacity in local infrastructure) but it also has public footpaths and is used by a lot of Hildenborough and Tonbridge residents for good health and well-being, particularly dog walkers, and this has increased markedly over recent years. This green area would be a considerable loss were it to be developed.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42835073	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88.</p> <p>All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No ?</p> <p>significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead.</p> <p>The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808</p> <p>This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road).</p> <p>The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency ? to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved.</p> <p>All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity).</p> <p>Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowed during peak times. A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times.</p> <p>With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban!</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>As we have seen with the recent developments in Hildenborough (Oakhill, and Hlyden Heights) they are developed and promoted to non locals increasing the population by default. With an ever increasing population through out of city transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be ? sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42754753	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88. All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead) significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead. The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808 This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road). The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved.</p> <p>All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity). Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowded during peak times. A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times.</p> <p>With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban!</p> <p>As we have seen with the recent developments in Hildenborough (Oakhill, and Hlyden Heights) they are developed and promoted to non locals increasing the population by default. With an ever increasing population through out of city transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42641505	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88. All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead) significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead. The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808 This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road). The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved.</p> <p>All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity).</p> <p>Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowded during peak times.</p> <p>A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times.</p> <p>With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban!</p> <p>As we have seen with recent developments in Hildenborough they are developed and promoted to non locals with no infrastructure changes increasing the population by default.</p> <p>With an ever increasing population through out of borough transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772865	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88. All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead)</p> <p>significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead. The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808 This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road). The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency</p> <p>to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved. All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity). Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowded during peak times. A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times. With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban! As we have seen with the recent developments in Hildenborough (Oakhill, and Hlyden Heights) they are developed and promoted to non locals increasing the population by default. With an ever increasing population through out of city transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be</p> <p>sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772897	Question 8	<p>Site:59669,79,53,56, 15,92 &88. All of these sites are within the Flood zone and increase the likelihood of flooding to this area and adjacent lower lying areas (Leigh Road and Brookmead)</p> <p>significantly. Currently these fields and trees absorb much of the water run off which would filter through to the adjacent residential area and importantly to the Stocks Green school and high risk area of Brookmead. The land here is home to many large trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer, bats and foxes.</p> <p>Site: 59771 - The stream and surrounding habitat that is within this site is home to 'rare crested newts', which are endangered and protected by law. They were first discovered during the Oil Pipeline enhancements in 2018. Access is also restricted to Renovo Care home.</p> <p>Site: 59808 This land is a large, biodiverse site, home to badgers, deers and other wildlife. There are a large amount of old trees within the fields, which protect the adjacent housing from flooding. Water run-off from the land already impacts the neighbouring main Tonbridge Road, which is regular under pressure during winter months (drains are always spilling over and water is laying on the busy road). The land also has a busy public footpath that is in regular use by the local and surrounding residents for mental well-being & dog walking (thus reducing capacity on the local NHS services).</p> <p>Site: 59592 This is currently an orchard with multiple varieties of apple, pear, plum and apricot trees and supports a diverse range of wildlife including badgers, deer and foxes. This site contains a water body (small lake) as shown on the title which is fed from a stream on land further up that contains rare crested newts. Investigation should be completed by the environment agency</p> <p>to check if this is also a natural habitat and breeding zone for this protected species. The site is also fronted by many trees which set the character of the village as you drive through. This view of the village should be preserved. All of the above sites listed will impact the local infrastructure (healthcare, schools and buses) which is already over capacity with waiting lists for the nearby schools and GP surgery. Current waiting times for a face to face appointment in Hildenborough is two weeks! This hasn't taken into account that we are about to have a further 75 rooms in the new care home (thus significant NHS Services) and a further 160+ homes/apartments in the new Oakhill development (pre Fidelity). Transport links are currently strained, with many bus routes reduced and buses over crowded during peak times. A21closures continue to cause havoc through the village and air pollution is significantly increased during these times. With the exception of 59771, all of the land proposed is Green belt which should by its nature prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence as per government description! Changes to the land will significantly change the setting and special character of Hildenborough and change its status of Urban Service Centre to Urban! As we have seen with the recent developments in Hildenborough (Oakhill, and Hlyden Heights) they are developed and promoted to non locals increasing the population by default. With an ever increasing population through out of city transfer, the need for additional infrastructure and housing is not going to be sustainable for this area or met by the current targets and the need for proposed sites will be endless.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42583393	Question 8	<p>Site59811 Oxenhoath This proposed site is in designated parkland . Tiny lanes surround it on all sides. Only access to main Hadlow road is along lane with no passing places . Currently you have to reverse often for 50 yards or so to let a tractor pass and this usually involves reversing off the tarmac onto rough verge. Access to Hadlow Road cannot be widened without compulsory purchase of two houses at end adjoining main road . As capacity for this site is nearly 2,500 houses where are 5,000 car going ? This proposed site would be completely gridlocked. There is one tiny doctors surgery in Hadlow with no room to expand. It cannot take any more patients just now and it is virtually impossible to get an appointment.</p> <p>There is only one tiny primary school with no room to expand. No secondary Poor bus service through Hadlow village which is already gridlocked much of the day. This site is not viable it is quite a ridiculous proposal. Currently land is used for food production either with animals grazing or with cherry apple and fruit production. It provides rural employment It is important in its function for grassed areas of carbon capture and with carbon capture from the wooded areas within it. It has incredible wildlife . A refuge for Badger , deer , foxes and birdlife including Red kites and birds of prey. Completely unviable to introduce 2500 homes</p>	<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.</p>
42735841	Question 8	<p>sites 59441, 59442, 59443, 59445, 59456</p> <p>I can only speak for the area in which I live but I vehemently object to development on the above sites in Leybourne. I chose to live here because of its green spaces and the open feel of the development. There is a lot of wildlife on Leybourne as well including foxes, owls, woodpeckers, hedgehogs, which use these green spaces and our wooded areas. I do NOT want to see Leybourne becoming like the monstrosity of Kings Hill. Green space is good for mental health and I and many others enjoy walking in our green spaces and enjoying nature. The GP practice is not fit for purpose for the residents who already live here (not open regularly, poor small facility) and we already have to go to Kings Hill surgery more than we should. The public transport out of Leybourne is abysmal and since I have lived here services have been cut. I used to commute to London and there has NEVER been a bus service from Leybourne to West Malling Station for early commuting to work. This is not the area to add more houses on because fo the above issues. I cannot speak for schooling but can imagine the local primary is full. Where do the extra children go to school? How can the GP surgery take any more families? No no no to any new housing on lovely Leybourne.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721025	Question 8	<p>Sites 59550 and 59552 are adjacent play areas, one being a playing field the other a play ground. They are the only recreation sites in this area and one should be able to access green sites within 500m of home. It is unlikely that one site would be developed without the other. Yet their benefits are stated to be that they are close to a recreation area. If both are developed that would not remain the case.</p> <p>We believe there is a Covenant to prevent building on these Brindles Field play areas which has around 70 years remaining.</p> <p>In relation to the biodiversity in the area there are a variety of trees in this vicinity and a plethora of wildlife can be seen here which would be disturbed. The objective of an increase of 10% in biodiversity would not be aided if these are used but would be reduced.</p> <p>Residents in this area are not within the catchment area for the very popular Sussex Road primary school, hence there is an increase in the congestion around school run times. Brook Street has 3 schools and a college, 2 of which have pupils from far afield, many of whom drive themselves to the 6th form and college. Additional housing in this area will add to this congestion and pollution.</p> <p>The other sites in this vicinity would also have many of the same issues.</p> <p>In relation to the Haysden area development development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the area.</p> <p>I cannot register at a GP surgery within walking distance, nor a Dentist. Further housing in the area will create further burden.</p>	<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.</p>
25315361	Question 8	<p>Sites 59702 59790 59826 59847 are rated as being within 800m of health care facility. The facility will be displaced to Peters village before the Plan takes effect.</p> <p>Sites 59702 59666 59826 59790 59841 59768 59831 are rated as being within 400m of a bus stop but the bus service is now only 2 busses a week.</p>	<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.</p>
42394785	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbelt AONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42834049	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbelt AONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42720545	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and/or AONB and would cause harm to the existing local environment. All these sites would significantly reduce access to quality education, healthcare and similar facilities which are already under stress. All would impact on Air Quality which is already an area of great concern in and around Borough Green. Flooding is already experienced within Ightham and surrounding areas. All these sites would have a significant and detrimental effect on water management.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42719777	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and/or AONB and would cause harm to the existing local environment. All these sites would significantly reduce access to quality education, healthcare and similar facilities which are already under stress. All would impact on Air Quality which is already an area of great concern in and around Borough Green. Flooding is already experienced within Ightham and surrounding areas. All these sites would have a significant and detrimental effect on water management.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
42718689	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbelt AONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42718689	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871,59793,59709,59872,59770,59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbeltAONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38354465	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871,59793,59709,59872,59770,59830 are not suitable because they are in greenbelt and or AONB and would cause harm to the greenbeltAONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42755137	Question 8	sites 59720,59608,59871,59793, 59709,59872,59770, 59830 not suitable as they are all in the green belt	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42657345	Question 8	<p>SITES 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59835</p> <p>These sites are overlapping and are all on vitally important green belt land that is of great value to the local community. Access to the sites would involve overloading the roads through Willow Lea and Shipbourne Rd or destruction of protected ancient woodland. This should mean that this site is not considered for development. Horns Lodge Lane is a public footpath and it is used by many local residents. Any development would significantly detract from the enjoyment of walkers (and others) - especially as the first part of the path is the most accessible for elderly locals.</p> <p>59804 includes a private road, a public footpath and parts of privately owned housing plots. The fact that this site has been allowed to be submitted shows the lack of thought and consideration that has gone into the whole call for site and assessment process.</p> <p>Site 59801 has already been classed as “Unsuitable” for development. Nothing has changed in the interim period, so why is it included. It also is part of 3 other suggested site.</p> <p>There are a number of protected pipelines that run through these sites, which should preclude development in their vicinity. I believe there is a high pressure pipeline that runs through Site 59735 with a protection order banning digging foundations in the area. Also, not mentioned.</p> <p>Development of any of the above would be damaging to the local environment and community and should not be considered further.</p>	<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.</p>
42536801	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825 and 59827 are all wholly unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <p>All three sites are within the green belt and the Kent Downs AONB. If any of these sites were developed, they would be in conflict with GB policy and conflict with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan which gives advice on how "to conserve and enhance natural beauty" in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000.</p> <p>Shipbourne Conservation Area and the Shipbourne Design Statement make clear how damaging development would be to the village and to the AONB. The rural charm of Shipbourne and the tranquil beauty of the fields in and around the village are a source of pleasure and solace, not just to people living in the area, but also for the many people who come to Shipbourne from further afield to walk, cycle or simply rest their eyes on the rural landscape.</p> <p>The infrastructure is not in place for any of the Shipbourne sites (59779, 59825 and 59827). There are no shops in Shipbourne, no doctor's surgery, a very restricted bus service and only one very small primary school which is already oversubscribed, and the roads are too narrow and dangerous to cope with the traffic, let alone the pollution to the AONB. The costs to rectify all of this would be too high to warrant the building work.</p> <p>The road junctions between Back Lane and Reeds Lane and between Back Lane and the A227 are already dangerous. Adding more people and traffic to the mix would be hazardous.</p> <p>There are land drainage issues in and around Shipbourne and the sewerage is already under too much pressure, with overflows repeatedly reported by villagers. The water systems are not up to the job of handling the existing population, let alone an increased population.</p> <p>Shipbourne is not on the gas network so the electricity grid would need to be upgraded.</p> <p>Specifically to each of the three Shipbourne sites:</p> <p>Site 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This site is Kent Downs AONB, Green Belt and connected to the Conservation Area. - Anyone walking through Shipbourne woods and the local public footpaths will gaze across this field to rest their eyes on the unspoilt rural landscape. The fields between the woods and Back Lane and Reeds Lane are especially beautiful and an integral part of the AONB. - There are serious land drainage issues on this site. The neighbouring houses have long complained of sewage 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>overflows. A watercourse runs along the southern boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reeds Lane is particularly narrow and dangerous (and has severe drainage issues). It already can't cope with the existing traffic. To add housing (and the resultant traffic) to this area would be irresponsible. - The junction between Reeds Lane and Back Lane is dangerous, with a narrow blind bend shortly after this junction on Reeds Lane. - The pollution caused by any building work, additional homes and the resultant traffic would inevitably cause harm to the AONB. - This site has been identified in Para 5.41 of the Sustainability Appraisal as being a least sustainable site option for allocation. <p>Site 59825:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This site is Kent Downs AONB, Green Belt and within the Shipbourne Conservation Area. - Building on this site would ruin the picturesque charm of the village. - This is a very open site. - The access onto Upper Green Road (which is narrow and treacherous, particularly in winter) and Back Lane is dangerous - There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne, so no need for mixed development. <p>Site 59779:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This site is Kent Downs AONB, Green Belt and on the edge of the Shipbourne Conservation Area. - The site is on a very dangerous junction between Back Lane and the A227. Moreover it is opposite Shipbourne Primary School, and any added traffic would be a danger to children at the school, especially at pick up and drop off times. - The bus stop on the A227 only provides a (very restricted) school service. - There is poor drainage on the southern boundary of this site. - There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. 	
42721185	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825 and 59827 should not have been included after the sustainability appraisal based upon the use of Green Belt and AONB.</p> <p>Further cause to eliminate these sites include, lack of services, lack of infrastructure, dangerous road conditions, erosion of the Shipbourne Conservation area, presence of an active covenant restricting development on the land included in site 59779</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746785	Question 8	Sites 59779, 59825 and 59827, all within our small, rural village of Shipbourne lie in the green belt (GB) and Kent downs AONB (KDAONB) and any development would be against GB policy and the KDAONB management plan. Site 59825 is within the Shipbourne conservation area, whilst the other two sites are at the very edge of this important area. The adopted Shipbourne design statement clearly indicates how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. The development of any of these 3 sites would have a hugely negative impact on the landscape and character of our small village with no amenities, except for the tiny primary school which my youngest children are very fortunate to attend as places are scarce. We walk to Shipbourne school every day and both back lane and Upper green road are particularly dangerous to traverse; Back lane because it is a cut through route with terrifying junctions at both ends with speeding cars and restricted visibility of both pedestrians and other vehicles and upper green road because of its narrow nature, lack of pavements and reduced visibility around bends. The proposed access to site 59779 being so close to the school entrance will provide yet another danger to our children as they arrive and leave their school. The village is poorly set up for these comparatively large developments, not only due to the few, already dangerous, roads but also due to the very little public transport (the bus routes being little more than school routes), no gas network (requiring electricity grid upgrade) and the water and sewage systems that are already at capacity. In particular, site 59827 already has sewage overflows and land drainage problems. Site 59825 would be particularly visible and would very much alter the rural feel of that central part of the village. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne and people/families placed here would have poor access to public transport and amenities. There is an active covenant on site 59779 that restricts development.	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.
42803297	Question 8	Sites 59779, 59825 and 59827, all within our small, rural village of Shipbourne lie in the green belt (GB) and Kent downs AONB (KDAONB) and any development would be against GB policy and the KDAONB management plan. Site 59825 is within the Shipbourne conservation area, whilst the other two sites are at the very edge of this important area. The adopted Shipbourne design statement clearly indicates how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development. The development of any of these 3 sites would have a hugely negative impact on the landscape and character of our small village with no amenities, except for the tiny primary school which my youngest children are very fortunate to attend as places are scarce. We walk to Shipbourne school every day and both back lane and Upper green road are particularly dangerous to traverse; Back lane because it is a cut through route with terrifying junctions at both ends with speeding cars and restricted visibility of both pedestrians and other vehicles and upper green road because of its narrow nature, lack of pavements and reduced visibility around bends. The proposed access to site 59779 being so close to the school entrance will provide yet another danger to our children as they arrive and leave their school. The village is poorly set up for these comparatively large developments, not only due to the few, already dangerous, roads but also due to the very little public transport (the bus routes being little more than school routes), no gas network (requiring electricity grid upgrade) and the water and sewage systems that are already at capacity. In particular, site 59827 already has sewage overflows and land drainage problems. Site 59825 would be particularly visible and would very much alter the rural feel of that central part of the village. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne and people/families placed here would have poor access to public transport and amenities. There is an active covenant on site 59779 that restricts development.	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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42588737	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825, 59827 all at Shipbourne</p> <p>Shipbourne is a rural area as defined by the plan. It is in the green belt and the Kent Downs AONB. The centre of the village and around Shipbourne Common is a designated conservation area. It has just over 400 households spread over a wide area with low housing density. It has no gas and no village shop, only a pub, a church, and a village primary school. The school is a small village primary school with under 60 pupils. It has had 2 extensions in the last 25 years and no further extension is possible. The bus service is virtually non-existent except for the school bus. However it is the 'green lung' for Tonbridge. At weekends cars are parked all along Upper Green Road from the A227 as far as the village hall; two way traffic becomes impossible. The Back Lane/Hildenborough Road is an east/west rat run during rush hour and crosses the busy A227 just by Shipbourne school.</p> <p>Any building development at Shipbourne would alter the character of the village and stretch the existing infrastructure/services to breaking point. to the detriment of both the residents and the visitors who flock to Shipbourne for its beauty and the access it provides to the surrounding countryside. The adopted Shipbourne Design Statement (https://shipbourne.com/2019/07/shipbourne-design-statement/) indicates clearly how vulnerable Shipbourne is to development.</p> <p>Site 59779 The border of the proposed site on Back Lane is extremely busy at the beginning and end of the school day. I am told that there is a covenant on this land restricting development.</p> <p>Site 59825 This site, in the Green Belt and AONB abuts onto the conservation area. Collins Cottage (listed grade 2) backs on to the north side. The site has been set aside for many years which has encouraged the birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians. Upper Green Road running along its NE boundary from Wightwicks, a short terrace of whitewashed agricultural cottages, along a rising incline provides a delightful approach from the east towards the expanse of Shipbourne Common. Walkers in Back Lane enjoy the view across the rising ground of the proposed site. All this would be affected by building development, whether residential or some other mixed use purpose; (There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne).</p> <p>Sites 59827 The south side of this site is bounded by a stream which is likely to affect land drainage. Beyond the stream is Dene Park Wood. "Dene Park is a large mixed woodland with an array of pathways from which to explore the variety of deciduous trees and conifers and enjoy glimpses into the surrounding countryside" (Forestry commission website). These 'glimpses' would be lost if site 59827 was developed.</p>	<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.</p>
42834081	Question 8	<p>Sites 59779, 59825, 59827: All three sites are within GB and AONB. All are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to current GB and AONB policies. Development of any of these sites would have huge impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services, other than the small primary school which is already oversubscribed. Junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic since the road is used as a rat run through to the A228/A26 and cross country to the A21 and Hildenborough Station. No gas in village, sewerage system would need redevelopment, water supply would need upgrading. No jobs in village (except at pub and school).</p>	<p>Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42550785	Question 8	Sites 59797 / 59800 - cannot believe that the golf course has been listed here. Local amenity. Green belt land. Community asset. Open space. Used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders etc. It's loss would be an abject failure to safeguard residents well being and health.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council is also preparing an Open Space Study.
42612225	Question 8	Sites 59797 and 59800 - development of these 2 sites would materially affect the King Hill Golf Course and bridlepaths, with significant detrimental impact : - the loss of golf, walking and cycling recreational facilities and employment opportunities - the loss of historic woodland, agricultural land - impact on varied and rare wildlife - the golf course is an agreed amenity from the original development of Kings Hill more than 25 years ago	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council is also preparing an Open Space Study.
42587713	Question 8	Sites 59800 and 59802; although there are bus stops on the A26, the service along the A26 is infrequent. There are bus stops on Kings Hill, but the busses see little use. These two sites will inevitably result in significantly increased traffic down Canon Lane (a quiet lane, only single track with a dangerous junction onto the A26) and have a negative impact on the Air Quality at Watringbury Crossroads. Sites 59624, 59797 and 59799: see comments for 59802; in addition this is Grade 1 Agricultural land. Any increase in traffic through Watringbury will exacerbate the situation at the Crossroad, which already breaches the UK limit on NO2 levels. The three monitoring sites in Watringbury have consistently been the worst three in the Borough over the last 5 years. Site 59729 is Grade 1 Agricultural land and will increase traffic down Red Hill, which is the least bad NO2 site in Watringbury but still exceeds the UK limit. Site 59803 is Grade 1 Agricultural land. For all of these, the Report makes mention of green space available nearby. Development on these sites will remove that green space.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42588609	Question 8	<p>Sites 59800 and 59802; there are bus stops on the A26 but the service is unreliable. There are bus stops on Kings Hill, but the busses see little use. These two sites will inevitably result in significantly increased traffic down Canon Lane (a quiet lane, only single track with a dangerous junction onto the A26) and have a negative impact on the Air Quality at Watlington Crossroads.</p> <p>Sites 59624, 59797 and 59799: see comments for 59802; in addition this is Grade 1 Agricultural land.</p> <p>Any increase in traffic through Watlington will exacerbate the situation at the Crossroad, which already breaches the UK limit on NO2 levels. The three monitoring sites in Watlington have consistently been the worst three in the Borough over the last 5 years. Air pollution has been recognised as a cause of a person's death in Southwark: we do not wish for the same action to be needed here.</p> <p>Site 59729 is Grade 1 Agricultural land and will increase traffic down Red Hill, which is the least bad NO2 site in Watlington but still exceeds the UK limit.</p> <p>Site 59803 is Grade 1 Agricultural land.</p> <p>For all of these, the Report makes mention of green space available nearby. Development on these sites will remove that green space.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42719201	Question 8	<p>Sites 59808 and 59592 in Hildenborough are in a area of Green Belt and can be only used for development in Exceptional Circumstances. There are no exceptional reasons especially as they are near the huge Fidelity development. As the village is in its settlement boundary this would threaten the boundary and teh anti-coalescence policy. Also Woodfield avenue is a narrow road and unable to cope with the additional traffic.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42776129	Question 8	<p>Sites 59823 and 59801 are greenbelt land which must remain protected to avoid overdevelopment and destruction of the existing environment. There is no viable means of access to these sites and building at these sites will cause huge stress on local residential roads and cause major congestion on the London Rd.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42541281	Question 8	<p>Sites in Addington are not sustainable - especially site 59850 East Street - it says within 400m of a bus stop - but the buses hardly ever run, and the bus service (58) is under treat by KCC of being stopped as no one uses it as it is so slow - it takes over an hour to get to Maidstone as it takes a rural route. The buses are not 2 an hour (as per national standards for sustainability) - also the train station is about 3 miles away in west malling. The sites are not sustainable.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42696769	Question 8	<p>Sites must be assessed to meet the economic and ecologic needs of our county. Any large residential development in a rural location fails to meet the strategic needs for a viable long term local plan.</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
46112513	Question 8	Sites situated in North Tonbridge - Grange Farm & Green Trees 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 I object to any development on these sites - they form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt & would lead to the loss of valuable farm land when the UK needs to grow as much food as possible especially grain & wheat that we used to get from Ukraine.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42754145	Question 8	Sites: 59779, 59825 & 59827 are all in the Green Belt and are areas of AONB, on the edge of the Shipbourne Conservation Area. The lanes through the Village are narrow and are subject to heavy traffic. There are no pavements. The junction of Back Lane and the A227 is dangerous and is adjacent to the small primary school, which is oversubscribed. The junction of Back Lane and Reeds Lane is also dangerous. The infrastructure of electricity, sewerage and water are already under pressure. There is no gas, consequently upgrading these facilities would be extremely costly.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42640897	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59793, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in green belt and/or AONB and would cause damage/ loss of this land	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42698177	Question 8	Sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830 are not suitable because they are in green belt and/ or AONB and would cause significant harm to the green belt and AONB	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42662273	Question 8	Small, rural villages should not be suddenly swamped with hundreds of new homes. Roads that are already severely bunged up during rush hour periods will be far worse, and doctor surgeries will be pushed beyond their limits. It's all very well suggesting sites, but no one involved ever bothers to drive through places during rush hour to get a sense of how busy an area already is. Watlingtonbury is one such case. Traffic is a nightmare at peak times, so how can adding extra homes be of help to anyone other than those selling the land, quotas, and those selling the houses?	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42442881	Question 8	Some of the site assessments consider impacts to be negligible or not have a negative impact which I disagree with for example site 59424 would involve felling trees, destruction of bio diversity and wild life habitats. How does this comply with COP 26 pledges? Also this site suggests potential for 100+ dwellings , how would the local health infrastructure be supported to manage this increase with a GP group that is already struggling to serve the existing population.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42720161	Question 8	Some of these are agreeable e.g. 59390, 59391, 59393 why indicate a small area only. 59852 agreeable but why not the whole of the field? Where an identified site has exit to a country lane this, if anything but a small development, will cause further congestion on those roads. Looking at the number of sites and having spent a considerable time on it already I reiterate my prior thoughts. No agricultural land should be used, the infrastructure Must be a significant consideration, traffic especially on rural lanes and roads.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42736577	Question 8	The approach to call for sites before a plan is agreed has been a charter for everyone with a piece of land to suddenly see the opportunity for development, no matter how inappropriate or protected the land. Only once a suitable plan ie urban focus and minimal greenfield land focused around existing urban developments (strategy options 1 and 2) is agreed should a call for sites be entertained. Sites 59770, 59720, 59871 and 59872 are wholly inappropriate for the area as they are not in urban areas and are in green belt. In particular site 59770 which is for mixed use is completely inappropriate for the location. The open green space is part of the character of the location and particularly important for maintaining the rural feel to this location. The sites are all in an area of very heavy traffic onto the A25, opposite or near the primary school, and there are already numerous crashes or near misses with the existing traffic moving onto/off the A25 from side roads. Bus stops and services such as school within 400m are mentioned however the actual availability of these services is very much in doubt, in particular buses which ar current levels certainly could not be used successfully in place of cars. Any development at these sites would inevitably lead to substantial increased car usage - this is a key reason why development should be focused on existing urban areas to reduce the necessity for additional car journeys.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. As explained in the full Interim SA Report (paras 2.38 and D.2), the site assessment criteria include a number of distance-based criteria used to estimate the likely effects of site options. A number of the appraisal assumptions refer to accessibility from site options to services, facilities, employment, etc.
45356801	Question 8	The areas if most concern to us are sites 59797 and 59800. Development would result in the loss of the gold course which is part of the Green Belt. The loss of the gold course would cause the loss of an important amenity enjoyed by golfers, walkers and cyclists alike. The road infrastructure cannot support current traffic & demands resulting in regular traffic jams and bottlenecks.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. Associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
38882465	Question 8	The assessment is not balanced. Building on car parks in West Malling can impact the vibrancy of the village with more residents shopping and socialising outside the Borough in Maidstone, Tunbridge Wells and Bluewater. This could lead to economic decline of that area. Hoath Wood has been designated as brownfield even though much is ancient woodland protected by TPOs.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42792577	Question 8	The assessments seem reasonable. In particular being in an area in Brookmead with a significant risk from flash-flooding (varying levels of water in my bungalow 4 times since 2019) I would emphasize the comments on Sites 59615, 59653, 59656, 59669, 59692 and 59679 about flood risk which would not only affect properties on these sites but increase the risk for existing properties in Stocks Green Road, Leigh Road and the Brookmead estate.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42443201	Question 8	<p>The BG Garden City has no funding for a Relief Road. Developers have to prove the site is financially viable, but the cost of remediation, road, infrastructure, and lack of any coherent plan to fund the road make this whole site unviable. There is no provision for a Secondary School, therefore children will need to be driven/bus/train to remote towns. Borough Green has ongoing sewage issues. The medical centre is operating at maximum level. Bus provision has been severely cut.</p>	<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.</p>
42443393	Question 8	<p>The comments below refer to the sites in north Tonbridge on the land occupied by Greentrees and Grange Farm: 59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809 I object to any development on these sites because of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGN as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural lands (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine and our need as a country to be self sufficient in food. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land is saturated. 4) Development of these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be even worse with the proposed Tudeley and Paddock Wood development . This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development would lead to significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on local health, educational and sewage services. 8) There will be negative impact on the town centre due to expansion ie shops, parking etc 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42714369	Question 8	<p>The comments refer to the following sites</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to these sites for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form part of the Metropolitan Green Belt 2. It is clear that the status quo in terms of food production no longer exists due to the war in Ukraine. These sites consist of Grade 1,2 and 3A agricultural land 3. They are prone to flooding in wet weather 4. The local drainage systems cannot cope with existing demand 5. Development on these sites will cause further demand at peaks times on the A26 into Tonbridge town centre which struggles to cope as it is. 	<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.</p>
42496161	Question 8	<p>The comments refer to the following sites</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to these sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form part of the Metropolitan Green Belt 2. After the war in Ukraine I thought the need for better self efficiency in agriculture would be obvious. These sites consist of Grade 1,2 and 3A agricultural land 3. They are prone to flooding in wet weather 4. The local drainage system cannot even support the existing housing. Twice our house has almost flooded when the main drains have become overwhelmed 5. Development on these sites will exacerbate the existing peak time problems on the A26 getting into Tonbridge 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42462145	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of ~Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the Metropolitan green belt fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF This was the principal reason why we were not included in the previous development plan. 2. They consist of productive best most valuable agricultural land (Grades I, 2 and 3a) The importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification. # 3. They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4. Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into ~Tonbridge and other local roads. <p>The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in ~Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells BC local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6. Development will irrevocably alter the open semi rural low density character of North Tonbridge 7. Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8. There will be significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9. These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities ie shops schools medical facilities etc. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42720833	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees :</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons :</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This is a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2.3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Well Borough Council local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter open, semi-rural, low-density character of North Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42556609	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . 59685 . 59690 . 59693 . 59721 . 59805 . 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land become saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elms Lane. Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of North Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42649249	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees;</p> <p>.59685 .59690 .59693 .59721 .59805 .59809</p> <p>I object to any to any development on these sites, for the following reasons;</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A) the important of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land become saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6)Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities-shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42740897	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Green trees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991,carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42834785	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the North of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Green Trees:</p> <p>-59685 -59690 -59693 -59721 -59805 -59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2. They consist of productive, BMV, agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3. They are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4. Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. 5. Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6. Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi rural, low density character of North Tonbridge. 	<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.</p>
42453697	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the metropolitan green belt fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2. They consist of productive best most valuable agricultural land (Grades I, 2 and 3a) The importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification. 3. They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4. Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells BC Local plan This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elms Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5. Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6. Development will irrevocably alter the open semi rural low density character of North Tonbridge. 7. Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8. There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9. These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42716545	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 5980559809</p> <p>I object to any development of these sites because</p> <p>1 they form a vital part of the Metropolitan green belt 2 they consist of productive agricultural land more important to preserve now than ever before 3 they are prone to flooding and contain hidden springs 4 development of these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion all around the local area 5 development will lead to significant loss of biodiversity 6 development will alter the open semi-rural low density character of north Tonbridge 7 the local health and education services are already stretched, further development will cause even more stress on these areas 8 negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to expansion of town boundaries and population increase 9 these sites are not easily accessible to local facilities and amenities</p>	<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.</p>
42711041	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees.</p> <p>* 59685 * 59690 * 59693 * 59721 * 59805 * 59809</p> <p>I object to any development of these sites for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principle reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A) the importance of which has ben highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge wells Borough plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity</p> <p>.6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi rural, low-density character of Tonbridge of North Tonbridge.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of Town Centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42719105	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees.</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to any development of these sites for the following reasons</p> <p>1 They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous plan.</p> <p>2 They consist of productive agricultural land the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine.</p> <p>3 They are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4 Development on these sites will exacerbate peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads.</p> <p>5 Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6 Development will irrevocably alter the open semi-rural low density character of north Tonbridge</p> <p>7 Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8 There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9 These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42437217	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. Yes No 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42517665	Question 8	The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities 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.
42802017	Question 8	The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities 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.
44659585	Question 8	The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities 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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42712801	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, lowdensity character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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.</p>
42519233	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42784385	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: • 59685</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42362881	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons: 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42470753	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42589121	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42643873	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. <p>For my comments on these sites please see my separate comments on the ANNEX1 SA Appraisals.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42718753	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already overstretched local health and education services and will require a large financial in the infrastructure.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42834689	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
44659745	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42439137	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <p>*59685 *59690 *59693 *59721 *59805 *59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural low-density character of North Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not accessible to local facilities - shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42459937	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange farm and Greentrees:</p> <p>.59685 .59690 .59693 .59721 .59805 .59809</p> <p>I object to any development on these sites due to the following;</p> <p>(1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>(2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable Agricultural Land (Grades 1.2 ,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, The MAFF survey report of April 1991,carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>(3) they are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land is saturated.</p> <p>(4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic especially on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge well BC local plan. roads significantly affected include; A26/Hadlow Road, Cranford Road, three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham lane.</p> <p>(5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>(6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi rural , low density character of North Tonbridge.</p> <p>(7) development will add even more stress on to already overstretched local health and education services.</p> <p>(8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>(9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities; ie: shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42617921	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42626305	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42714689	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42587297	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way, Orchard Drive and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity in planned and surrounding areas.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 These fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt. These Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>2) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic Flood risk assessment.</p> <p>3) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>4) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>6) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>7) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>8) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>9) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>10)None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42718433	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42722017	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42799905	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42832129	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42803713	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42835169	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42460449	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42171937	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. <p>Detailed comments on each site's SA can be found in my separate comments on ANNEX1.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42659905	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722145	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42774849	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42607329	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42774273	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. and education services. increase. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 10) The drainage is not up to the capacity of dealing with any further development. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42616161	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 4) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 5) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 6) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 7) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 8) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 9) Lastly, these sites are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs. which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42730593	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities, etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
44657281	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
44660737	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991 carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42438113	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42487233	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>In respect to site 59657: this has already had a planning application refused and all the reasons still apply especially flooding and dangerous access and egress.</p> <p>In respect to site 59834: Ludicrous! The objections are too numerous to list. Access, pollution to river, totally car reliant, access to utilities, flooding, inaccessibility etc. etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42587393	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities. etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42590945	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42711105	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42715457	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42718561	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	
42774817	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802945	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42784705	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, lowdensity character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42616257	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42835233	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. and education services. increase.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42590049	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42401697	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42192289	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441665	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441697	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441825	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42441985	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42438529	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42448545	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>Mammals seen on Grange Farm land include:</p> <p>Badgers, hedgehogs, foxes, roe deer, field and door mice, voles and shrews, slow worms, toads, bats, dragonflies, various moths and butterflies, various fungi, wildflowers.</p> <p>Nesting Birds: Woodpecker - green and lesser spotted, bluetit families, heron, buzzards, long-tailed tits, nuthatch, starlings, robins, collared doves, wood pigeons, sparrows, pheasants, swallows, seagulls, owls, magpies, crows and wrens.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42470273	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42472993	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42457057	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>In respect to site 59657: this has already had a planning application refused and all the reasons still apply especially flooding and dangerous egress.</p> <p>In respect to site 59834: Ludicrous! The objections are too numerous to list. Access, pollution to river, totally car reliant, access to utilities, flooding etc. etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42495617	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42436385	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42520609	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42520737	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42479393	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42540865	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42260449	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42555937	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42273793	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42498753	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, Medical facilities etc</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42584033	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42519585	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42499233	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42594593	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42609057	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42627009	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42638305	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42640865	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42641121	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42648417	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. <p>Question 9 Do you agree with this set of strategi</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42702945	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42711937	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42713185	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42717505	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42606017	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42723777	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746081	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42436193	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42471425	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42752449	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42734561	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42775553	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42746401	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42790529	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes No</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42796353	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42440705	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42821985	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42828769	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42822305	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42834945	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan. 2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification. 3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated. 4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge. 7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services. 8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc. 	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42835361	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42664321	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59685 • 59690 • 59693 • 59721 • 59805 • 59809 <p>I object to any development on these sites, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.</p> <p>2) They consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages caused by the war in Ukraine. The MAFF survey report of April 1991, carried out on behalf of TMBC, confirms this classification.</p> <p>3) They are very prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4) Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5) Development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>6) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of north Tonbridge.</p> <p>7) Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9) These sites are not easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42529409	Question 8	<p>The comments that follow refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange farm and Greentrees</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to the development on these sites for the following reasons</p> <p>1.They form a vital part of the Metropolitan Green belt, fulfilling all the objectives of MGB as stated in the NPPF.This was the principal reason why they were not included in the previous development plan.,</p> <p>2.They consist of productive best most valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3a),the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages (UK imports 40% of its foodstuffs,Ukraine war has exacerbated this situation).The MAFF survey report of April 1991,carried out on behalf of TMBC confirms this classification.</p> <p>3.They are prone to flooding in wet weather and contain hidden springs which bubble up when the land becomes saturated.</p> <p>4.Development on these sites will exacerbate existing peak traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads.The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and P Wood,which is part of Tunbridge Wells B C local plan.This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads,including Hadlow road,Cranford Road,Barchester way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>5Development will put even more stress on the already stretched local health and education services.</p> <p>8 There will be significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>9.These sites are not easily accesible to local facilities - shops,schools,medical facilities etc</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42399681	Question 8	<p>The exercise for each site appears very poor. Accessibility, the separate nature of some sites and being Green Belt are not mentioned. Flood risk and surface water flooding is also not well investigated.</p> <p>The proximity to rail stations, schools and doctors is also poorly expressed. Having questioned the local school stated as being close to site 59692, they are a single form entrance for all years from Reception to Year 6. They currently have only 1 space and have 14 families on the waiting list for spaces. Hildenborough station has not returned to its pre covid timetable as well as the frequent closure of the ticket office and therefore its facilities thus forcing commuters to either Sevenoaks or Tonbridge.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be the key feature on these assessments especially all those sites on the B245 which is already under considerable strain and in spring will have the additional 168 units from the Oakhill development merging onto it (residents vehicles, supermarket deliveries, amazon deliveries etc).</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42801729	Question 8	The findings are not clear	Noted
42328449	Question 8	The findings are ridiculously complicated. They are hidden in a referenced document which is over 250 pages long. They are pretty much impenetrable to me without setting aside several hours of study.	Comments noted
42794625	Question 8	The findings may all be appropriate but it is impossible to comment with no significant knowledge of each local site. To find my local site was impossible, too. A detailed and properly linked Table of Contents is missing.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42756225	Question 8	<p>The following comments refer to the following site IDs which are within Hildenborough and surrounding areas:</p> <p>59823, 59801, 59688, 59704, 59669, 59679, 59627, 59783, 59615, 59692, 59745, 59592, 59808, 59656, 59653, 59771, 59775, 59667, 59609, 59625, 59804, 59798, and 59835.</p> <p>A significant theme in these is the reference to flooding which is significant and must not be ignored. Negative impacts on the environment are mentioned but then go onto say that how a proposed development is handled may mitigate this. However it doesn't say how, so I consider these to be very much 'jam tomorrow' statements without any real substance.</p> <p>Nearness of railway stations and buses are mentioned but it must be recognised that most will use cars to reach stations which is a negative impact on the environment and the roads infrastructure. Access to schools and medical facilities refer to sufficient capacity being available. At this time Stocks Green Primary School, with the current demographic, reports it has a waiting in double figures of children wishing to become pupils for their various classes. The ability of the school to cater for any for any population increases due to additional housing must be questioned.</p> <p>Those proposed developments shown in the Plan which are either in, or significantly link by road into Hildenborough, need to recognise the status of the B245 which appears not have been adequately considered in the plan. It is already a very busy main road, especially when the A21 Tonbridge By-pass is closed, and I doubt will be able to handle any significant increase in vehicular traffic brought about by the proposed housing developments some of which are shown to be extremely large.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Where specific inaccuracies are identified, efforts will be made to repsond to these in future iterations.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42687073	Question 8	<p>The following sites are on the green belt and at risk of flooding: 59609/59625/59661/59683/59685/59735/59834/59612</p> <p>The following sites are also on the green belt: 59651/ 59656/59690/59693/59721/59701/59804/59805/59809/59821/59823/59835/59838</p> <p>Of the above sites the following will exacerbate traffic congestion on the A26 and other local roads: 59685/59690/59693/59721/59805/59809</p> <p>And the following will cause unacceptable extra traffic through the Shipbourne Road bottleneck between Yardley Park Road and Portman Park: 59612/59683/59804/59735</p> <p>As will development on sites 59521/59522/59746/59798/59801</p> <p>Site 59683 will also lead to significant loss of amenity space at Tonbridge Farm sportsground.</p> <p>I strongly oppose any development on the area north of Brook Street. The sites here namely 59641/59695/59764/59765/59869 are at some risk of flooding. Development on them will adversely impact on the amenity of Hayesden Country Park and on views from the High Weald AONB as well as cause a completely unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street which will overwhelm the roundabouts along the A26 into Tonbridge town centre and worsen the already very poor air quality in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>The following sites target valued amenity space: 59521/59515/59516 59550/59552/59571/59572 as does 59683 mentioned above. Of these, sites 59550/59552/59571/5972 will contribute to the already significant traffic problems along Brook Street.</p> <p>Site 59417 is currently an educational facility. A development here is likely to result in its closure. The school is not only a needed facility for local children but also a significant local employer. The undeveloped part is at risk of flooding due to its proximity to a water course.</p> <p>As mentioned elsewhere, site 59588 is located on the outer bailey of Tonbridge Castle, a stone's throw from the ancient monument, in the middle of the Conservation Area and a much needed green space in a dense housing area.</p> <p>Site 59623 is at a prominent point in a Conservation Area. A recent planning application (Planning Application: 21/01677/FL) to develop it was refused on the grounds of loss of amenity for neighbours and inappropriate development in the Conservation Area. Site access is limited and developing the access onto Shipbourne Road would exacerbate an already-existing pinch point that frequently causes tailbacks. On sustainability grounds, surely a better use for the site would be to enhance the existing structure rather than knock down a perfectly fine building.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42720801	Question 8	<p>The following sites have been earmarked in Hadlow:</p> <p>59605, 59635, 59637, 59638 59647,59686, 59776, 59842, 59853, 59857,59601, 59811, 59859, 59410</p> <p>The village does not have the infrastructure (doctors, schools, road congestion) to support these sites being developed. Not only are some of these sites green belt, but some would also have a negative effect on the environment.</p>	<p>Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42603521	Question 8	The housing need is not going to benefit local people. It will attract those migrating from out of London.	Comment relating to housing figures noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
25361537	Question 8	The Kent Downs AONB Unit would be happy to provide high level informal comments on the potential impacts of sites within the AONB and its setting that are being considered for allocation, once an initial sift has taken place by the Council.	Comments noted.
25386113	Question 8	<p>The main issue with regards to Hildenborough Village is the retention of its separate identity apart from Tonbridge. The main threat to Hildenborough is represented by Site ID's 59835, 59798, 59625, 59609, 59804, 59745 and 59823. A development on this scale would effectively join North Tonbridge to Hildenborough having a detrimental effect upon the Village.</p> <p>Within Hilden Park, the existing development of Oak Hill House, a Brownfield site is considered to be a reasonable alternative use of the office accommodation; however, Site ID 59808 represents an over-development of that area and has serious implications with regards to access to the B245 which is already compromised by excess traffic flow. Site ID's 59615, 59692, 59656 and 59653 represent major issues regarding drainage owing to the topography of the local area which drains towards Stocks Green Road and hence uses the Hawden stream through the Gough Cooper Estate. This area is vulnerable to flooding despite the protection offered by the Leigh Flood Barrier; consequently development of these areas would aggravate the situation.</p> <p>Alternative sites without such drainage issues are available on other Brownfield sites along Stocks Green Road, e.g. 59688 and also adjacent site 59704.</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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42202241	Question 8	The majority of sites have inconclusive findings where it may or not be beneficial	Comments noted.
42016897	Question 8	The Medway gap as is rebounded needs to be left out of any further plan until local services have caught up GP appointments are a good example hanging on for hours on the phone to be told no appointments please try again tomorrow which incedently never comes.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42713697	Question 8	The methodology used fails to assess the infrastructure requirements of larger sites such as that at 59830 Borough Green Garden 'City'! The 'sites' which make up this particular proposal will need significant infrastructure development and service upgrades that appear not to have been taken into account within the assessment process.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42584737	Question 8	<p>The report does not address the impact of the proposed development on existing property i.e. the increase of surface water runoff from the new development will have a detrimental effect to adjacent areas that are already prone to flooding from surface water runoff.</p> <p>Sites:- 59615, 59653, 59656, 59669, 59679, 59688, 59692, 59704, if developed would increase the risk of flooding to existing houses in Stocks Green Road, Leigh Road and the Brookmead estate as the existing infrastructure is not capable of dealing with the surface water at extreme times furthermore it would bring added pressure on the road network that is already extremely busy especially around peak times and school drop off and collection times.</p> <p>Sites:- 59625, 59823, 59745, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59823, 59835, if developed would become an urban sprawl that would connect Tonbridge to Hildenborough thereby losing the gap between the two separate entities.</p> <p>The main road through Hildenborough to Tonbridge is already extremely busy and could not support the additional traffic.</p> <p>The local schools are already at capacity as is the doctor's surgery.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42584193	Question 8	<p>The report does not address the impact of the proposed development on existing property i.e. the increase of surface water runoff from the new development will have a detrimental effect to adjacent areas that are already prone to flooding from surface water runoff.</p> <p>Sites:- 59615, 59653, 59656, 59669, 59679, 59688, 59692, 59704, if developed would increase the risk of flooding to existing houses in Stocks Green Road, Leigh Road and the Brookmead estate as the existing infrastructure is not capable of dealing with the surface water at extreme times furthermore it would bring added pressure on the road network that is already extremely busy especially around peak times and school drop off and collection times.</p> <p>Sites:- 59625, 59823, 59745, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59823, 59835, if developed would become an urban sprawl that would connect Tonbridge to Hildenborough thereby losing the gap between the two separate entities.</p> <p>The main road through Hildenborough to Tonbridge is already extremely busy and could not support the additional traffic.</p> <p>The local schools are already at capacity as is the doctor's surgery.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p> <p>The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
39049377	Question 8	The report has fine words.	Support noted
42784417	Question 8	The reports do not adequately assess each site. The full impact of the AONB is not considered and the assessment of BGGC cannot be viewed as a single site. The sites cannot be viewed in isolation the sheer scale of the developments proposed in this locality (Wrotham & Stansted) will overwhelm the community.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42439169	Question 8	The reports on the studies of the various areas appear to be very comprehensive.	Support noted

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42784001	Question 8	<p>The selection of sites 59515, 59516, will result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities. These spaces have been used as POS for over 50 years, maintained for a greater extent by the council. They serve as the closest public amenity space to vast section of North Tonbridge. A range of occupancies occur during the day - morning dog walkers and joggers; children playing football and frisbe after school; older children hanging out in the wood or finding a sunny place to chill relax in.</p> <p>The space also serves as an important wildlife corridor- with its tall hedges ad wide open spaces - allowing wildlife to thrive over the whole area and not just a very few small pockets. Developing these areas would contribute further to these areas demise and isolation of the woodland. Once such areas are lost from the urban fabric you can never get them back - which is why they should be preserved in perpetuity .</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The Council will also be preparing evidence including an Open Space Study.</p>
38868193	Question 8	<p>The site assessments make little attempt to understand the local geography. For example, certain sites ignore impassable fences when considering distances and ignore sight lines on roads when proposing buildings. The spacial strategy is difficult to believe given the lack of effort that appears to have gone into assessing locations.</p>	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
45648321	Question 8	<p>The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut- through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a signiScant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
45648993	Question 8	<p>The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut- through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a signiScant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space Study.</p>
42772353	Question 8	<p>The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfills all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from Tuvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Open Space Study.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42445025	Question 8	<p>The sites in North Tonbridge are concentrated in one area (Greentrees & Grange Farm) and the comments apply to all of them: 59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>1) They are all designated as Green Belt and have previously not been included as development sites. 2) They consist of most valuable agricultural land (grades 1,2 and 3A). In view of recent world events we should not be squandering this type of land. 3) They tend to become flooded during spells of heavy rain. 4) If these developments go ahead it could mean the A26 would become even more jammed and would lead to increased traffic on the surrounding urban areas e.g. Higham Lane, where the new developments are proposed. 5) Loss of biodiversity 6) Existing schools and medical services are barely coping now and any additional developments would put excessive strain on them.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42373025	Question 8	<p>The suggested distances appear rather arbitrary and could lead to over development near schools and surgeries</p>	<p>As explained in the full Interim SA Report (paras 2.38 and D.2), the site assessment criteria include a number of distance-based criteria used to estimate the likely effects of site options. A number of the appraisal assumptions refer to accessibility from site options to services, facilities, employment, etc. There are a number of pieces of research that give a variety of recommended guidance distances for walking. For example, the Institute of Highways and Transportation found that the average length of a walk journey is one kilometre. Further to this, it categorises distances depending upon the location and purpose of the trip, as 'desirable', 'acceptable' or 'preferred maximum'. Given the wide range of services and facilities normally considered in SAs, LUC has developed some guideline distances that it uses in its SA work, and which are therefore reflected in the site assessment criteria</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
45361985	Question 8	The walking distance assessments are at best optimistic. You do not consider safety, hours of darkness and criminal activity. These factors are very important and impact upon any 'theoretical' assessment of this type.	As explained in the full Interim SA Report (paras 2.38 and D.2), the site assessment criteria include a number of distance-based criteria used to estimate the likely effects of site options. A number of the appraisal assumptions refer to accessibility from site options to services, facilities, employment, etc. There are a number of pieces of research that give a variety of recommended guidance distances for walking. For example, the Institute of Highways and Transportation found that the average length of a walk journey is one kilometre. Further to this, it categorises distances depending upon the location and purpose of the trip, as 'desirable', 'acceptable' or 'preferred maximum'. Given the wide range of services and facilities normally considered in SAs, LUC has developed some guideline distances that it uses in its SA work, and which are therefore reflected in the site assessment criteria
42078145	Question 8	There are no plans for infrastructure for any of the sites. Schools, medical centres etc are not detailed and therefore it is impossible to reach an opinion.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42807073	Question 8	<p>There are too many potential sites in Hildenborough, which is problematic for a number of reasons.</p> <p>1) lack of infrastructure - GP surgery is exceptionally busy already, schools are at capacity. there is only one real food general store (one stop).</p> <p>2) lack of transport options - it's virtually impossible to get around other than by car. It's difficult to walk to the train station and the bus provision is very poor</p> <p>3) flood risk - Hildenborough is at significant risk of flooding, even with the Leigh bund (yet to be built). A lot of these sites are flood plains and so that reduces the run off areas and affects the properties that are being proposed.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
42810913	Question 8	There are too many sites to comment on and I do not know the entire borough well enough. However I have concerns about the following- 59522, 59521, 59683 59516 - loss of amenity space	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
38330721	Question 8	There has been an assumption in favour of being close to health facilities as being positive for development, these are already at full capacity. Infrastructure is bursting & bus services are declining in rural areas meaning more people have to drive, this is at odds with the assumptions.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42447265	Question 8	There is such a large volume of information here and not all of it is correct.	Comment noted.
42202625	Question 8	There is too much emphasis on the potential to mitigate loss of habitat/biodiversity etc through development. You cannot develop a children's play area or large green open space and not have a loss of amenity space/habitat and biodiversity. There is an absolute disregard for homeowner's in the vicinity of these proposed sites and the impact it will have on their lives and wellbeing.	
38333377	Question 8	There's not enough room here to provide all my comments on specific sites but here are general comments on sites in Hadlow. 1. All sites along the A26 will generate more traffic through the village and should not be considered before any sites closer to stations or Motorway junctions or in the established urban centres. The A26 is extremely busy through the village and it is heavily congested at peak times, contributing to poor air quality. 2. Particular sites requiring access along narrow country lanes or using tight junctions with limited visibility will cause unreasonably dangerous increases to traffic flows and endanger pedestrians and other road users. 3. The flood risk from flooding and run off should rule out some proposed sites, in particular to those in the flood plain of the River Bourne. 4. The medical centre is already oversubscribed and is not accepting new patients. Although the primary school is not full, there are limited places in each year group. 5. Heritage assets, listed buildings and registered parks and monuments have protection which goes beyond the immediate curtilage to include the setting. If new development damages the setting of the listed building or park, for example by changing an isolated rural location into a housing estate, then it should be turned down. In the case of Hadlow Tower or Oxenhoath, part of the character and setting are the key long views which would be damaged by many of the proposed developments.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42732097	Question 8	<p>These comments refer to the following sites which are situated to the north of Tonbridge on the land known as Grange Farm and Greentrees: 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809. I object to any development on these sites for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They form a vital part of the Green Belt, fulfilling all the objectives stated in the NPPF. This was a principal reason why they were not included in the previous plan. Any development here would encourage the joining up of Hadlow and Tonbridge. 2. They consist of productive Best Most Valuable agricultural land (grades 1,2, 3A). Recent events have highlighted the importance of domestic food production. 3. There is a known history of flooding on parts of these sites: this is likely to be exacerbated by housing development. 4. There is already peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads, causing significant cut-through traffic in Cranford Road, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. The proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood would exacerbate this further. 5. Development would lead to a significant loss of biodiversity. 6. Development would irrevocably alter the open, low density character of north Tonbridge. 7. these sites are do not have easy access to local facilities. 8. Development would add to pressure on local health and education services, which are already stretched. 	
42593281	Question 8	<p>These relate to the sites north of Tonbridge known as Grange Farm and Greentrees .</p> <p>59685 59690 59693 59721 59805 59809</p> <p>I object to the development of these sites for various reasons ,</p> <p>They were not included in previous development plans as they formed (and still do !) a vital part of the metropolitan green belt</p> <p>They consist of agricultural land , confirmed in an earlier report . Which in the present situation (Ukraine War) is like killing the goose that lays golden eggs .</p> <p>As a resident of Cuckoo Lane i am aware of the flooding issues which occur regularly ,</p> <p>It will impact peak period traffic on the A26 already seriously strained with proposed Tunbridge Wells in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which will use Tonbridge as a Rat Run</p> <p>Further development will have an effect on the wild life in the area .</p> <p>Further development will seriously alter the character of north tonbridge from semi rural .</p> <p>As previously mentioned putting additional strain on local medical services and education facilities .</p> <p>Further impacting the town centre and generating more a larger population in an already stretched community .</p> <p>These sites are not easily and safely accessible , with no footpaths or lighting . Pedestrian and cyclist use case traffic problems already and limited passing places with restricted heavy traffic gives an indication of existing problems . Extra volume traveling to shops ,schools and health care must also become part of any future plans .</p>	
42080705	Question 8	<p>This document is a nightmare to navigate with no clear organisation or grouping of sites by location or address, sifting through 5000+ submission in a single sheet with no point of reference is very difficult. It is impossible to verify the robustness of the findings as a result and this must be set out much more clearly in future rounds of consultation.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42182913	Question 8	<p>This is a substantial body of information and while many of the findings seem fair for individual sites it's clear 1) that in aggregate they don't support or provide sufficient evidence across the 14 criteria for development eg in case of one Hugh site namely no 59740 Broadwater farm. Indeed the opposite is true. There will be a loss of prime agricultural land, harm to natural environment and wildlife, concerns about impact to water sources, harm to Quiet lanes in and around the conservation area. Impact on existing rural roads and the bypass, lack of infrastructure including roads schools doctors hospitals, plus it's disastrous impact on the coalescence of East Malling West malling and Kings Hill. Then my concern no 2 is that while the sites are individually scored I can't any analysis of the cumulative impact on the rural areas of sites in aggregate namely East Malling will cease to be a rural village should one or more of the proposed sites be developed eg 59824 and 59698 both adjacent to Clare lane and 59636 at Mill Street. In addition land on site no 59636 at the side of Stickens lane. To the north sites 57756 and 59844 see to be an extension of the 140 acre site. In addition sites 59631 and 59726 at Watlingbury Cumulatively a will as mentioned see coalescence of existing rural communities but equally importantly the level of all supporting infrastructure simply will not support this level of additional Concentred be new people populations.</p>	
38330977	Question 8	<p>this is also included under comments on appendix B:</p> <p>HILDENBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL'S COMMENTS ON PROPOSED SITES AFFECTING HILDENBOROUGH</p> <p>Sites in isolated pockets and not considered suitable by the Parish Council as it does not meet the criteria set by the Council for development in the Parish. Sites are in the Metropolitan Green Belt which should not be impinged upon in these areas. Infrastructure would not support development on these sites: 59627, 59783, 59771, 59775, 59667</p> <p>Sites within the Green Belt which should not be developed in isolation as currently they are not adjacent to development and would require substantial infrastructure to be provided for their development. 59688, 59704, 59669, 59679, 59653</p> <p>Sites within the Green Belt which are adjacent to developed areas where significant infrastructure would be required to support it, as well as resulting in significant road congestion along the A227 which is already a black spot. Most importantly to Hildenborough development would not leave a green corridor between Hildenborough Rural Centre and Tonbridge. 59823, 59801, 59609, 59625, 59798, 59835, 59804, (59745 could affect the corridor between Tonbridge and Hildenborough)</p> <p>Sites within the Green Belt which when placed together do adjoin the built up area but have significant infrastructure considerations as follows: 59615 and 59692 infill the area between the main rail line and the current built up area but will have implication for run off water into the Hawden Stream drainage system which is currently inadequate during periods of heavy rain. This results in flooding in the Brookmead area of foul water (last occasion 2 years ago when houses was narrowly averted from flooding with foul water). These areas are both currently within the Green Belt 59656 – this is an important drainage area feeding into the Hawden Stream system via West Wood where steps to slow down flow have been undertaken. Further run -off will contribute to additional water feeding into the Brookmead area. Under no circumstances should the ponds and storage of run off water be removed. This area is historic parkland, but it does have access to both Stocks Green Road and Tonbridge Road and is adjacent to the current built up area. 59808, 59592 these sites both extend the current built up area, but there is a considerable problem with drainage in this area with the B245 (Tonbridge Road) frequently subjected to a heavy flow of run off from the hillside. Drainage streams in the area are frequently not maintain exacerbating the problem.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
45811265	Question 8	<p>This is high agricultural land which forms part of the Met. Green Belt fulfilling all the objectives MGB as stated in the NPPF - being the reason it was previously turned down! With change of climate and world conditions all high grade agricultural ground should be preserved!! The main A26 plus local roads cannot accept the additional traffic!!</p>	<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.</p>
42616929	Question 8	<p>This is in relation to 59608. It is the only one I really feel I can comment on as I know that site. This is for information. It is a site that is currently a nursery. This is a going concern and an active business (deliveries come to it and suppliers pick up plants from it regularly). I am surprised that this is being considered as it seems to be a business that can continue and reflects the benefits of economic growth and potential to grow further. It seems that this site is an active and sustainable economic site with potential for employment opportunities, that offers in itself important biodiversity as a green open space close to a heritage asset and AONB.</p> <p>The plan for 37 houses is quite intensive. One of the biggest issues is access. The access in the road is limited; in several places it is only a single track including in a significant single track stretch by the entrance to the site on either side which does not allow for large lorries to go through either due to it being so narrow.</p> <p>The site is opposite a nature reserve –preserving a particular highly specialised flora which could be disrupted by pollution from cars and which depends on a particular water system. https://www.kentwildlifetrust.org.uk/nature-reserves/ivy-hatch .</p> <p>I understand there is some sort of deed of covenant on either the property or the land (perhaps to do with the property being part of the nursery).</p> <p>The survey notes it is possible to get to a bus stop. However, the bus transport is incredibly limited and at the moment the buses to tonbridge were cut over the summer but have had a reprieve from being cut altogether from its one school service and one hourly service that runs for only half the day – there are very limited ways to get to any school (we experience this problem trying to get our children to secondary schools without buses). The route to sevenoaks I think only runs about 2x a day. It would be difficult to see how anyone could live there without one or two cars as there is no other reliable access to transport nor any amenities near by (it being incredibly hilly makes cycling difficult for any but the really fit). It is near a heritage asset (Ightham Mote) which also means congestion is difficult to manage at one end of the road. It is very close to AONB, in itself represents a level of biodiversity and open natural spaces – there are woodpeckers and birds of prey that live at that nursery site as well as the nature reserve opposite. When the main road was shut for repairs due to a sink hole we experienced quite how unable our road was to cope with a lot of traffic.</p> <p>What I assume is desk-based research into the site does in general reflect some recognition of the difficulties of the site including those listed above. The poor accessibility is noted for example. It notes it is nearish some amenities - The primary school is some way away - (my children went there, and in snow we walked and it took about 45 mins with little children) so again cars are necessary; that school is on a site where it would be impossible to build more. Borough Green medical practice is a drive away – certainly not walkable - and currently under so much pressure we do not really</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>get to see a doctor any more. There are aspects noted that would need further exploration – water for instance due to the brook and areas of water that runs through the nature research that could not be disturbed.</p> <p>SA objective no 9 may be something I am not really understanding but while this is a brownfield site it is a nursery so that might impact the soil assessment – it seems unlikely that building over what is a natural open green-filled space would mean less contamination (or lead to improved soil). This is a space that is natural and full of growing plants. It does in itself contribute positively to biodiversity as it is a green and thriving landscape – bringing housing would actually be detrimental to the current situation around climate change (SA 11); while SA 5 does acknowledge this to some extent it is difficult to see how housing here, even with good landscaping, could improve this.</p>	
42520801	Question 8	This is NOT user friendly. I cannot comment on a document that I have not seen!	Comment noted.
42638369	Question 8	<p>This is where we move from the strategic - to which the site assessments are directed - to the particular. At the strategic level there is little room for debate, because of necessity the assessments have to be generalised. Refer to my answers to Q2 and Q4.</p> <p>An aside: Site 59493 appears to be Borough Green Station Car Park. If so this makes no sense as the Car Park is undersized as it is - see below. Brief comments on particular aspects of the larger sites near Platt follow.</p> <p>Site 59839, the former "Garden Village", is totally out of scale for Borough Green. Sites 59877, 59748 and 59843 are more or less contiguous and together cover 17 ha on which 374 houses would be built - plots of 455 m2 or 21m*21m. Site 59703 is 0.7 ha with 20 houses - plots of 350 m2 or 19m*19m. Also out of scale. Q4 answer very much applies here.</p> <p>Some infrastructure issues to amplify Q4:</p> <p>Road Capacity: The A25 is already a chain of bottle-necks from Wrotham Heath to Bessels Green. Development on this scale would exacerbate this congestion, and that on the A20 and A227. The J5 Slips and the Borough Green relief road are essential contributions to reducing existing congestion, leave alone that generated by new housing.</p> <p>Public Transport: Rail and Bus services are failing to cope with demand, and the BGW station car park is full to overflowing. Provision of additional capacity would be essential.</p> <p>Air Quality Pollution: levels in Borough Green in 2014 were high enough that an Air Quality Management Area had to be declared; this should limit development. The traffic generated by development on this scale would increase pollution levels, and adversely impact public health.</p> <p>Supporting and Social Infrastructure The early construction of such services as electricity, gas, water, telephone/broadband, schools, medical and social facilities would be essential.</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.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42717409	Question 8	<p>This section of my response is with reference to Site 59871, Site 59872, Site 59793, Site 59720, Site 59709, Site 59770 and Site 59794.</p> <p>Development of these sites would add pressure on local schools (Ightham, Borough Green and Wrotham) which are unlikely to be able to provide spaces for all children who would move into the area with the number of proposed developments. With this in mind, and considering the typical lifestyle of the families moving into these areas, they will therefore be heavily reliant on the use of cars to get their child/children to school, commute to work (or drive to Borough Green and Wrotham train station due to the continued closure of rural bus routes by KCC and the lack of accessible footpaths to the train station) and carry out daily activities such as shopping and leisure pursuits. This would exacerbate the traffic problems already seen in the areas with added pressure on already narrow, busy roads resulting in increased air pollution and unsafe roads (as many current road users drive in excess of the speed limit).</p> <p>Limited parking availability at Borough Green and Wrotham train station could also cause congestion on streets around Borough Green with the increase in cars community to the station on weekdays.</p> <p>All sites stated above would see the loss of areas of the Metropolitan Green Belt and harmful development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This would put pressure on land and wildlife with the loss of habitats and result in negatively impacting the biodiversity and geodiversity of the area.</p> <p>Development on these sites would hinder the enhancement of the borough's landscape and townscape character which make Ightham and Wrotham such attractive places to visit with the history that is associated with the villages. Whilst the proposed developments may be designed to be in keeping with the architecture of current buildings, the associated development of these properties along with the heavy reliance on cars by occupying residents would see the roads in the villages struggle to cope.</p> <p>There are limited business and working opportunities local to these sites with little opportunity to improve on these due to a) no suggestion in the Local Plan that commercial properties will be built on the sites or b) the limitations associated with development on the Green Belt. Therefore this would push new residents to use their cars to commute in and out of the area.</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.
43598241	Question 8	<p>This would have multiple negative impact on the environment surrounding the area we live in by damaging natural habitats and eco systems. Pollution would also increase as residential areas expand which would impact all residents, including children.</p> <p>The infrastructure to support residential expansion doesn't exist. The schools are already over subscribed by current residents, as are the GP surgeries, dentists and so on.</p> <p>Continued proposed expansion of residential properties in this part of Kent is disproportionate to the rest of the county, this cannot continue without challenge.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42722721	Question 8	Thy form parts of the green belt areas	Comment noted.
42773057	Question 8	Tonbridge is already congested especially around where I live and extra traffic created by 59521, 59522, 59612,59683, 59735, 59746,59798,59801,59804 will decrease air quality and increase risk of accidents.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42719457	Question 8	<p>Tonbridge Road/Back Lane Ref 59779.</p> <p>1.This field has a covenant on preventing any Residential development on, thus making it non deliverable.</p> <p>2.There is a Primary School on this Road and more traffic would be dangerous to school children at drop off and pick up.</p> <p>3.The Tonbridge Road/Back Lane junction is already hazardous with busy traffic.</p> <p>4.Insufficient drainage exists on the southern boundary.</p> <p>5.This area is Green Belt and not Countryside. Given TMBC have not met 5 yr housing numbers, NPPF Policy still wouldn't be in favour of consent as there is harm to the design statement of Shipbourne also. This is an ANOB designated site.</p> <p>Conclusion: This site is unsustainable and undeliverable with current policies in place covering conservation and enhancement of this AONB village. Development on this site would have huge negative impact on the character and landscape of this small village which has no services other than a small primary school, already oversubscribed. Section 106 Education contributions would not solve this. The junctions at both ends of Back Lane are dangerous, and Back Lane experiences speeding traffic as the road is used as a cut through to and from the A228/A26 to A227 and cross country to the A21. The Bus stop mentioned in relation to this site is only used at school times. The village is NOT on a gas network, so the current grid would need substantial upgrading to sustain any of the proposed developments in Shipbourne. Finally, Sewerage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827. Further to this, for provisions of water, current systems are inadequate to accommodate new development.</p>	<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.</p>
42832929	Question 8	Too many inaccuracies which I detailed in my response but the website crashed and lost my responses.	Comment noted.
42715777	Question 8	Too much focus on just building on farm land. Where are the brownfield site classifications. These should be mapped and prioritised for regeneration and development.	Comment noted.
42393985	Question 8	Unable to determine from the data provided	Comment noted.
42491169	Question 8	Undecided - need more information	Comment noted.
42350689	Question 8	Until the infrastructure of the existing borough is sorted further expansion is ludicrous. The health service, roads, schools etc. are at breaking point. Who will benefit from further housing? Not the people of the borough but the companies who undertake the new developments.	<p>Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42816257	Question 8	We act on behalf of a key landowner of Site Reference 59796. We broadly agree with the findings of the site assessment for this site. We note the potential yield is identified as "TBC". Our own Call for Sites submission identified the capacity as 120 units which we consider to be an appropriate potential yield based on the range of development options on this site. We recommend this potential yield is included in an allocation policy for the site. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the content of such a policy in advance of the next Regulation 19 stage consultation.	<p>Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42799297	Question 8	We agree with the comments made by West Malling Parish Council, which we contributed to.	Noted.
42587585	Question 8	we don't have time to go through every site in this time limited way but will add comment son specific sites as our answers progress	Noted.
45440929	Question 8	We have set out a more detailed consideration of the land north of Church Lane in the context of the information which we have assembled in respect of the Site and the development opportunity – this results in a more positive scoring still.	Comment noted.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42795361	Question 8	<p>We understand that a natural sorting and sifting process will take place, however of the initial 291 sites put forward, 174 are on Green Belt land. These should be considered only once full appraisal has been undertaken on those 117 sites which are not on Green Belt land.</p> <p>The main threat to Hildenborough is it becoming merged with Tonbridge and Site IDs 59835, 59798, 59625, 59609, 59804, 59745 and 59823 should be considered in bulk as to develop any of these will detrimentally affect the clear demarkation of the boundry of Hildenborough.</p> <p>Site IDs 59615, 59692, 59656 and 59653 present major drainage issues which require considerable understanding on the costs to prevent the Brookmead estate flooding as all water courses feed into the Hawden Stream along both sides of the low lying Stocks Green Road.</p> <p>Site ID 59808 presents overdevelopment of that area. Whilst the Oakhill development was Brownfield site and the plans were sympathetic to maintaining the open spaces, this new site is greenfield.</p> <p>Site ID 59688 is brownfield and could be deemed suitable for settlement due to walking proximity to the station and bus stop, with the option of access points on 2 roads leading traffic away from the B245.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
42430081	Question 8	<p>What a number of these do not take account of (they key sited listed below) are the noise pollution from 4 roads and motorways by replacing trees/hedges with buildings. and the increased traffic pressure as well as towns/villages losing identity as they are swallowed up/become one large urban area and resulting in residents of those areas not having the opportunity to enjoy the rural locations (bridle ways, country footpaths etc)</p> <p>cfs refs: C60cbc d10f6c d98dob f1b1c7 c7ba47 d5a33c and site IR (no ifs ref available): 59488</p>	<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.</p>
42809057	Question 8	<p>Whilst the individual site assessments are adequate. There is insufficient consideration of the cumulative landscape level effects and the adjacency problem. In particular we note that almost all of the largest sites identified > 1000 and many of the medium sites >100 fall in the area between Hadlow, Mereworth, Wateringbury, Kings Hill.</p> <p>These sites alone account for about 12,000 houses but all of them are in the green belt. I am very concerned that they will therefore be seen to offer a quick and easy option to reach the target of 16,000.</p> <p>Traffic congestion in this area, exacerbated by the limited bus services along the axis Maidstone, Wateringbury, Hadlow, Tonbridge, will lead to a significant deterioration in usability of the road network.</p> <p>I therefore believe that the call for sites exercise is not fit for purpose and that the call for sites should only be focused on areas selected for development in the strategic plan option selected.</p>	<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.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42818337	Question 8	<p>With regards to sites 59779, 59825, 59827:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reference to a minor positive of being in close proximity to a primary school is misleading. Shipbourne Primary has only capacity for 59 children (and usually the year cohorts are full) and the site cannot be extended to build larger classes due to lack of space. - References to proximity to a bus stop need to allow for the fact that bus links are extremely infrequent in Shipbourne and hence a car is essential to travel. Also, the closest train station is 3miles (Hildenborough) and hence only accessible by car, therefore adding to greenhouse gas emissions. - There are no comments regarding the very small roads and hence limited accessibility and congestion that dense housing on these sites would cause 	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.
42589313	Question 8	<p>With respect to specifically the North Tonbridge Proposed Grange Farm and Greentrees sites, the sites consist of High Grade Agricultural land which the country as a whole need for more self-sustainable food production as a result of worldwide uncertainties in food supply into the future. These areas out of the food production season suffer from seeping natural springs which manifest themselves with local flooding towards and beyond Cuckoo Lane and across to Hadlow Road. The road infrastructure and accessibility cannot sustain any more traffic, Tonbridge is a traffic nightmare as it is. Tonbridge is a small market town and will be brought to its knees, the infrastructure of schools, doctors, dentists, transport cannot cope.</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.
42519201	Question 8	<p>Yes in principal, but I do not believe the Borough Green and Long Mill area has sufficient infrastructure to support major development</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42438369	Question 8	<p>Yes. I understand that the majority of development has been in the built up areas of Tonbridge and that there is consequently far less potential there now. It seems clear therefore that development must go into less developed areas starting with those that have the best existing infrastructure.</p>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42801569	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :) 1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt. 2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages. 3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from Tuvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment. 4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street. 5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane. 6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area. 7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use. 8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain. The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities. 9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town. 10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase. 11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42197217	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42745217	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously allocated and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772193	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42772257	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42774913	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802209	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the serve objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802337	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously allocated and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42798145	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42771841	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain!</p> <p>The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42793889	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience:</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traUc along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
38488257	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764,59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>It is in particular sites 59834 and 59661,59662 and 59663 that have driven me to respond to this consultation. The idea that such a substantial amount of development whether it be residential or commercial be focussed on a narrow strip of functional flood plain that is also green belt is ridiculous. This land flood every winter, as it is supposed to as an area of flood plain. Even substantial mitigation works would just pass flood risk further down or upstream.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42820609	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tonbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516,</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721505	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic Toot risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tonbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cutthrough traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42722785	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42721569	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, Yes No 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from Tivial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42751009	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously allocated and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from tidal and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tonbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain!</p> <p>The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42788001	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cutthrough traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42789249	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42802081	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42197121	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42687425	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652, 59653, 59656, 59661, 59662, 59663, Yes No 59683, 59685, 59687, 59589, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfil all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously allocated and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from tidal and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690, 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tonbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 59572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
42834721	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here for my convenience :)</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the Sve objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from Tuvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695, 59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traffic congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road untilPortman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a signiScant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to signiScant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insuUcient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a signiScant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.	
42723649	Question 8	<p>You will need to input the information below into the PlaceMaker software for your convenience. The sites and reasons for their unsuitability are listed here:</p> <p>1) Sites 59609, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59652,59653, 59656, 59661, 69662, 59663,59683, 59685,59687, 59589, 59690, 59693,59695,59701, 59721, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59834, 59835, 59838, 59865 and 59869 fulfill all the five objectives of Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>2) Sites consist of productive, Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A), the importance of which has been highlighted by recent food shortages.</p> <p>3) Sites 59609, 59644, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59683, 59695, 59735, 59764, 59765, 59834, 59865, 59798, 59804, 59834, 59865 and 59869 have been previously affected and are all at increasing risk of flooding both from fluvial and surface water sources and many are identified as being at huge increased risk as recognised by the strategic flood risk assessment.</p> <p>4) In Southwest Tonbridge sites 59550, 59552, 59571, 59572, 59641, 59695,</p>	<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. The Council will also be preparing evidence including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Respondent ID	Section of the Reg 18 Interim SA Report	Comment	Response
		<p>59764, 59765 and 59869 will all contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic along Brook Street and will overwhelm all the roundabouts along the A26 from Brook Street, St Stephens', Vale Road and will worsen the air quality in the Air Quality Management Area in Tonbridge High Street.</p> <p>5) In North East Tonbridge development on sites 59685, 59690 , 59693, 59721, 59805, 59809 will exacerbate existing peak period traUc congestion on the A26 leading into Tonbridge and other local roads. The situation will be further worsened as a result of the proposed development in Tudeley and Paddock Wood which is part of the Tunbridge Wells B.C. local plan. This will lead to cut-through traffic on local roads, including Hadlow Rd, Cranford Rd, Three Elm Lane, Barchester Way and Higham Lane.</p> <p>6) In North West Tonbridge the extra traffic generated by 59521, 59522, 59612, 59683, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804 will cause extra traffic along Shipbourne Road through the bottle neck between Yardley Park Road until Portman Park and this will worsen the situation in the Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>7) Development on sites 59572, 59612, 59625, 59641, 59661, 59662, 59663, 59685, 59689, 59690, 59693, 59695, 59721, 59735, 59746, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59764, 59765, 59804, 59805, 59809, 59821, 59823, 59835, 59865 and 59869 will lead to a significant loss of productive agricultural land or land with that potential future use.</p> <p>8) Site 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground where we have been told there is insufficient spare capacity for a Baseball Diamond but that we can now squeeze in hundreds of houses on a floodplain! The selection of sites 59515, 59516, 59521, 59522, 59550, 59552, 59554, 59555, 59571, 599572 will all result in an unacceptable loss of amenity space for our communities.</p> <p>9) Development will irrevocably alter the open, semi-rural, low-density character of the communities on the current edge of Tonbridge town.</p> <p>10) There will be a significant negative impact on the functioning of the town centre due to the expansion of the town boundaries and consequent population increase.</p> <p>11) None of the sites identified on the Green Belt around Tonbridge are easily accessible to local facilities – shops, schools, medical facilities etc.</p>	