

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 4] What are your reasons for selecting this parti...

### User Response: Text

Further development would increase opportunities for local area development including accessibility and improved access to resources

Keep as much rural land as possible, but build up Rural service centres so the people do not have to travel into major towns to access services. If the service centres are not developed we will eventually lose what few services we have.

Distributed development does not impact so heavily on already over burdened areas with services as they are in my area at breaking point essential GP practices dentists social care and even the local veterinary practices are over full capacity this focussed over development is unsustainable in the short term and is already at crisis point the roads are chocked and pollution is increasing .

There is too much development around where we live

There is less intrusion into AONB, greenbelt and rural areas and development is confined to existing areas of development.

It's not close to where I live.

Restrict development to urban areas and don't concrete over our countryside and spoil our villages.

Communities in all of the existing settlements are at breaking point with development exceeding the local infrastructure's ability to cope. Kings Hill has benefitted from the dealing of the A228, but has reached its capacity and without significant additional spending on infrastructure, we are full.

A new settlement, planned around significant infrastructure is required. This should be immediately adjacent to the M20 or A21 corridors and also around one of the main train line routes into London. Let's do this right, build something for the future rather than trying to grow villages and settlements designed in medieval times.

Option 1 protects the countryside (green lungs within the borough) and retains the character of individual villages.

I don't want any encroachment into green spaces

How many sites in the Borough have already been given planning permission but have yet to be built on?  
It is essential to preserve all green areas in view of Climate Change. As proven in Lockdown the preservation of green areas is also essential for the mental health of the community.

Green belt land should be avoided at all costs

Established transport infrastructure, areas where schools are not oversubscribed, large footprint for different types of dwellings (flats through to 4/5 bed detached houses), outside of greenfield and AONB, near pockets of industrial/commercial use estates potentially offering employment.

AONBs and Green Belt should be protected for our country's sake and sake of well-being of people who live in our county. Residents should be able to get out into the countryside

---

**User Response: Text**

Berkeley supports Strategy Option 3 as the most suitable strategy option for TMBC, where development would be focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and rural service centres, including Borough Green. Option 4 is also supported for the same reason. These options allow for a balance between development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities, as well as meeting the needs of a wider range of communities in accessible locations.

Option 1 is unlikely to be found sound since it would fail to provide an even distribution of housing to meet borough wide needs.

Option 2 is unlikely to have sufficient capacity to meet the borough's housing need and ignores the need for new homes in smaller settlements for existing communities.

Option 3 suffers from the same problem as option 2.

An even distribution of housing proportionate to the needs of each settlement is likely to minimise the burden of housing on each community whilst ensuring the widest range of need can be met.

Option 5 is likely to be highly complex due to the substantial range of required infrastructure. There is no clear choice for a new settlement in the borough and focussing so much need in one new place with lengthy delivery timescales and high infrastructure costs could easily derail the whole plan: See for example the approach in Tandridge District and the South Godstone Garden Village.

Tonbridge is already over-developed. I'm OK with development on brownfield sites in the town.

Option 3 spreads the load more evenly around the existing Urban and Rural Services centres. This seems to me to offer the best combination of utilising existing transport infrastructure and reducing the damaging impact of more housing on any one area. Whilst also protecting the rural communities from having their characters and green space utterly destroyed.

By focussing on these areas, urban sprawl can be avoided and thereby retain the character of the existing small villages.

Limit impact on more rural areas and allow access therefore to existing jobs, schools, transport networks.

Areas of outstanding natural beauty and green belt must be protected to reduce urban sprawl

I live in a new development within Peters Village and I would say there is now enough houses in this area developed/being developed. Any further developments in this area will cause overcrowding, contribute to environmental concerns and there will be an increase in traffic which the local roads will not be able to take and lack of local parking spaces. I would much prefer a strategy option in my selection that 'spreads out' developments to other areas that need development to avoid Urban Sprawl. The green space on our side of the river between Burham and Borstal is the only green area left that isn't protected so ideally housing developments will be preferred elsewhere.

Protection and expansion of, green belt paramount rather than the disjointed free for all that appears currently to be the case

---

**User Response: Text**

utilise already good Access to vital services and facilities

We should not build on green field sites, until ALL brown field has been used. Currently builders ride rough shod over everything.

I think development needs to be shared out round the borough as long as it suits the site. Developments in villages and the smaller towns should go hand-in-hand with improved bus services, retention of village schools and encourage medical services even on a part-time basis. To concentrate on already urban areas perpetuates the problems of the lack of services in rural settlements.

I don't agree that kings hill should lose designated green spaces or develop on size further. I believe that new self contained communities can be developed with their own infrastructure.

all seem very focused away from tonbridge

It appears to cause the least damage to the countryside and green spaces near to the urban areas.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development. Additionally, concentrating development in smaller parts of the borough puts a disproportionate health risk from construction on those areas. Breathing in all the construction dust for many more years to come has got to have a detrimental effect on our lungs. HSE <https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/cis36.pdf> .. The opening paragraph on their page relating to dust construction: "Construction dust is not just a nuisance; it can seriously damage your health and some types can eventually even kill. Regularly breathing these dusts over a long time can therefore cause life-changing lung diseases"

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

It protects the greenbelt for future generations and protects the small villages from being more developed and protects their character and to date these have been part of the charm of the county.

I would like to see development spread out between existing areas of housing reducing the need to encroach on the greenbelt. Although I realise some greenbelt may need to be used.

Given the unique characteristics of our boroughs very limited land bank it makes sense to look for a new settlement site. This will avoid the stresses that come from developments that are add on to existing conurbations which will lead to a coalescence/ merging of existing towns villages into unattractive unplanned sprawls of densely populated (under supported in terms of per person infrastructure) black spots.

Preserve what we have while developing a wider range of housing, especially affordable flats

---

**User Response: Text**

No encroachment on green belt only brownfield sites should be used.

Not sure I fully understand the options but have chosen this one as it appears to be spreading the impact of more development across more sites with proximity to existing centres but without impacting greenfield sites too heavily. Essentially, however, I believe that Tonbridge and Malling, and the south-east generally has already taken more than its fair share of new development and the council should seek to resist further development on the grounds that government is seeking to redistribute business, jobs and opportunities to other parts of the country. New housing should move correspondingly to serve the shifting population.

1. Does not build on Green Belt

2. maximise use of brownfield - but the plan needs to show that all brownfield has been utilised BEFORE building on greenfield

3. then minimal build on greenfield.

4. building larger urban areas in north east of borough will allow efficiencies of scale - including transport and public services, including maximising use of modern, energy efficient flats and greater social housing

5 preserve character of historical areas

6 prevent towns merging

New developments within repurposed areas. For example i the thousands of empty offices and shops.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion worsening air quality and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The growth and enhancement of already developed locations should be the priority. This will lessen the need for new transport links and services such as new schools and medical facilities. However, it must be ensured that this supporting infrastructure is improved in already developed locations to cope with whatever additional capacity is required.

---

**User Response: Text**

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Since being here the area is one conurbation merged into another, no distinct differences anymore. The medical provision is already terrible, too many cars etc. cycling is dangerous. The only housing is "executive" none of it affordable. I am afraid I feel despair about any of the choices.

This way, everyone shares "the pain" and it avoids the horrendity of one huge new township linking Borough Green and Wrotham, i.e. Option 5

This will reduce the impact on existing residents with respect to loss of green spaces on their doorstep, increased traffic congestion and air quality, access to already overstretched medical and dental services. Reduce loss of the uniqueness and heritage of small villages which can become joined up.

Too much countryside is being lost.

Congestion and pollution on Kent roads is not assisted by removing wide open spaces and covering in tarmac and housing.

I repeat no building at all

The green belt should be protected as a priority. Environmental concerns need to take a lead. In addition to this, it is not practical to rely on services in already established areas because many of them are already over subscribed.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Option 2 provides opportunities to exploit existing infrastructure and local services; at the same time preserving the Green Belt and AONB

The Green Belt must be protected, otherwise urban sprawl will never stop until there is no green space left. Once it's gone, it's gone. There are so many options to develop previously developed land within existing urban areas.

It is recognised that there is a need for further development and a broad area of search for new potential sites, where so much of the land within the Borough could provide viable opportunities, should be adopted.

Greenbelt is extremely important - must retain.

All these development proposals involve focussing on the Medway Gap, where we already have roads that clog

---

**User Response: Text**

up completely at peak hours, narrow lanes, a train service that is expected to decline and no buse. Option 4 is therefore the least bad, spreading out the development while option 5 requires abandoning the Green Belt, which is unacceptable and not likely to happen, even under the present government

Berkeley supports Strategy Option 3 as the most suitable strategy option for TMBC, where development would be focused on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and rural service centres, including West Malling. Option 4 is also supported for the same reason. These options allow for a balance between development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities, as well as meeting the needs of a wider range of communities in accessible locations.

As is noted under paragraph 5.3.24 and shown in figure 9, two principle Housing Market Areas exert an influence across Tonbridge & Malling, these being the Maidstone HMA and the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA. As is highlighted under paragraph 1.22 of the Housing Market Delivery Strategy (July 2022), it has been necessary to apportion a share of TMBC's standard method Housing Need Figure (SM\_LHNF) of 839 dpa to each of the HMAs of which the Borough forms a part. Paragraph 1.23 further states 'a reasonable basis on which to split the Borough's overall housing need figure of 839 dpa into the two areas' is 478 for the Maidstone HMA and 361 for the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA.

In order for the Spatial Strategy to align with the evidence produced in the Housing Market Delivery Strategy, Strategy Options 1 and 2 are untenable as these focus too great a quantum of development solely within the Maidstone HMA. Only Strategy Options 3 and 4 allow development to be set in the most sustainable locations within the Borough, whilst meeting the needs of both HMAs and more rural local communities set within the Borough. Regarding Strategy Option 5, the creation of a new settlement that is remote from public transport links and existing services would not be considered sound in relation to the suggested settlement hierarchy. In TMBC we consider that new homes would be most sustainably be provided within or adjacent to existing settlements where they are served by supporting infrastructure such as schools, health care centres, open spaces, and opportunities for active travel such as walking and cycling.

To protect Green Belt and AONB, and avoid swamping small villages with mega-developments like "garden cities".

Green Belt should be retained at all costs.

If new developments are built in existing urban areas then there is no guarantee that the infrastructure to cope with the influx of people will also been provided. This has happened before. Many times.

It seems the required infrastructure (healthcare, amenities etc) are far more likely to be taken properly into consideration within a new settlement than within existing urban areas.

AONBs must be preserved. Options 3, 4 and 5 are just completed disasters and would represent a devastation of the local countryside.

Economies of scale. Provide excellent infrastructure with local services to those currently in the Urban centres. Ensure excellent safe, transport links out to the Rural recreational areas and provide excellent policing of rural areas to avoid litter and anti-social behaviours.

Once bedded in, extend the provision with new builds on the edges of the Urban Centres.

It would be useful to be able to score these in a priority order. In which case I would go for a mix of 3 and 5. My reasoning is to distribute the impacts of development on the environment, facilities and communities evenly. The

---

**User Response: Text**

other options will significantly change the character of certain areas.

It would appear to be the lesser of the evils of the plans

Retaining greenbelt land and protecting biodiversity. Preventing over population in areas of already over subscribed amenities and infrastructure.

Protection of Green Belt. Build on brown field sites such as Railway car parks (keep car spaces on ground floor and have development above)

This is a difficult question and I would have preferred to have been putting four of the five options in order of priority. In my case this would have been Option 3, Option 2 Option 5 and Option 4. I don't think Option 1 should be considered as it cannot come close to satisfying the Housing Market Area criteria and therefore it should be totally excluded.

In this order of priority my prime concern has been the ability of the existing settlements to cater for the new development and the ability of the developer or other funding sources to raise the standards of communal and transport infrastructure to properly cater the final settlement as a whole and so ensure it develops into a sound community that people want to live in.

Tonbridge must take it's share of development. The Kings Hill / West Malling area would need very significant improvements in transport, secondary schools, doctor and dental facilities to take even more people

I would prefer to see no developments at all as I believe the government have got their strategy wrong. A consolidation of existing sites (brown fill) and an improved infrastructure, not expansion. However if the council has to expand then do so in areas where the infrastructure already exists.

Development in Tonbridge invariably means 'executive mansions' not affordable houses and takes up greenfield sites for a privileged few.

In-filling, aka ribbon development along rural roads is creating built-up corridors which hide the rural character of the borough.

The Medway Gap area has brownfield sites outside the commuter zone of London and the houses are less likely to be pushed up in price by London commuters.

But the Medway Gap area is at the heart of KCC's biodiversity plan so any building there will need a gold standard biodiversity plan. Nothing conventional will do.

It is essential to protect the areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty for the benefit of people living in urban areas and for Nature.

Option 4 is the least problematic of the proposals, other options involve development in the Medway gap which already suffers from narrow lanes meaning congestions on roads at peak periods and other busy times, there is an absence of buses, medical facilities are oversubscribed whilst option 5 means the greenbelt will need to be

---

**User Response: Text**

abandoned which is totally unacceptable.

It builds on the least amount of green belt land which is the most important thing for me it also has minimal impact on outlying villages and concentrates on main areas. I think the choices are poor and more thought should go into already developed areas

The green belt boundary is very important to me

The development area should be expanded to allow for construction of quality homes (homes for life, energy efficient, sustainable etc) rather than a focus on dense low quality housing.

As noted above, I think it is important to concentrate the development heavily on Urban areas and leave the Green belt and other areas untouched as far as possible.

By concentrating development in services centres, new residents can be serviced by sustainable public transport and be less reliant on car transport. This will be beneficial to the mitigation of climate change.

Option 1 clearly isn't viable because it provides little additional housing for people working in the west of the Borough, in Sevenoaks or other similar locations. The Duty to cooperate with Sevenoaks was an issue with the previous draft plan. It is difficult to see how the Council could adopt Option 1 and simultaneously claim to be co-operating with Sevenoaks Council.

Areas like Kings Hill and Snodland are an easy and obvious target for development. They continue to grow but the services available there do not. For example the doctor surgery serving west malling and surrounding areas is swamped. It's impossible to get an appointment. Kings hill in particular continues to grow and will eventually mean the surrounding, historical towns and villages merge into one; they will lose their identity. Kings hill will spread to the A20 at Leybourne, the A26 at Watlingbury and out to East Malling to the east; this will cause enormous traffic problems. It's already gridlock along the A228 whenever there is the slightest problem with traffic flow. The hierarchy is a useful method of identifying the size of areas but perhaps development should be focussed more towards the bottom of the pyramid to grow smaller developments and keep them "alive" whilst improving services for the people who currently live there. Objections to development should not be based on the fact that the place is currently quiet and would not be in character with the existing size of the location because that means there will never be development there which hardly seems fair to those areas inundated with development destroying the surrounding countryside and woodland just to avoid upsetting a few people surrounded by empty unused farmland. I don't agree with destruction of woodland or areas of outstanding natural beauty but if land is unused and ex-farmland there should be no reason to destroy natural habitat.

Options 4 and 5 would effectively urbanise the whole area. Many people living in the current urban areas value their proximity to the countryside and traditional villages and enjoy visiting for recreation. Surrounding the rural



---

**User Response: Text**

villages with new development would remove this rural feel from the area.

Development in the rural areas would not be sustainable. It is not safe to cycle or walk on the small lanes for transport to a stop for a (non-existent) bus with the current traffic load and this would become worse. To live in the rural areas and small villages it is necessary to have 2 cars for a family. This also makes such development unaffordable for many people and not desirable going forward. Development in villages and rural areas should only be allowed at very small scale to provide affordable housing for the existing communities.

If we don't protect the green areas now, it won't matter. Any option that allows people to develop more into green areas must not be considered.

I think it's important that the rural settlements in the borough should be protected to prevent urban sprawl of one big entwined urbanisation at the cost of our existing villages. I understand the need for increased housing but it shouldn't be at the cost of local communities losing their identity by joining up the dots on the map through development. I live in Burham and if option 1 or 4 are implemented we will see the beginning of the end of Wouldham, Burham and Eccles as they will all be joined together ruining the essence of village life.

To protect the identified hierarchy of urban development, it is critical that existing brown field sites and the bigger urban areas are used for future building. Encroachment on smaller community areas will ruin them forever, turning smaller villages and rural areas into unattractive locations. People have chosen to live in these areas for the very reason that they are smaller and away from the busier towns and built up areas.

To avoid over-development in the Borough, bearing in mind that most of it is Green Belt with major constraints. And to avoid additional pressure on infrastructure - particularly the increased pressure on roads that are already congested, but also pressure on schools and medical facilities.

Public transport links and not encroaching on existing villages such as Eccles , Burham but also offering better infrastructure

Option 2, or possibly Option 3.

The adoption of the local plan should primarily consider which option does the least harm to the borough as a whole. Developing rural communities involves so much more destruction as roads and transport links require significant improvement.

It is far more logical to extend existing urban settlements, as the facilities and services are already there. Building where there are good public transport links is better for the environment as fewer car journeys are needed, and you therefore address climate change. Children should be able to access schools, colleges and leisure facilities with ease, which is not the case with rural developments.

Building on the edge of towns will allow people to access shops and places of work more easily, which is better for the economy and eases town centre traffic congestion.

In turn, you preserve the the rural communities, leave more of the countryside unblemished, and retain the

---

**User Response: Text**

character of the borough for future generations.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

I strongly believe focus should be on PDL to limit greenfield impact but spread across the borough - limiting it to one edge of the borough which is already alongside a very developed adjacent borough will create unsustainable impact on local services in those areas.

Close to Motorways and train lines, and builds on the Govt strategy to develop the Medway towns.

The plans for building within and adjacent to urban areas is destroying any green space for current residents. The impact on biodiversity and human wellbeing would be hugely negative. There is no space for parking currently which will just get worse.

Option 2 appears to protect Greenbelt land and AONB, whilst also retaining defined space between developments

These areas already have good transport links and services. Although all the greenbelt should not be taken off the agenda as there may be sites that fit the strict criteria under which the council could propose some housing development.

Looks like consideration has ben given that towns/villages don't merge into one and loose their individual and differing identities.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in

---

**User Response: Text**

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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing

This is the only option that protects the integrity of West Malling and provides a stopping point for the river of concrete running from Maidstone to East Malling. The separation of East and West Malling is essential to prevent the blurring and obliteration of the identity of these communities.

**To be clear I do not agree with any of the options as they are currently drafted, there should be an Option 6 where new settlement are prioritised over expanding existing urban and rural service centres.** The only real option to meet the capacity demand as set out by the government (unless this can be challenged) is to focus on creating new settlements and putting in new infrastructure and services away from existing Urban and Rural Service Centres. The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment you have commissioned from ARUPS clearly agrees with my view as it states in its conclusion "The evidence currently available indicates tha the borough: - Has limited opportunity to accomodate its needs within existing built-up areas".

Existing Urban and Rural Service Centres are at capacity and the road networks in and around these areas cannot cope. Schools and healthcare facilities are at capacity and cannot be expanded sustainably.

Take the opportunity to build new settlements and create new sustainable communities away from the existing Urban and Rural Service Centres.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- \* 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
- \* To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan

---

**User Response: Text**

It is entirely illogical to place new homes where there is little if any work opportunities or infrastructure e.g., roads, water, medical facilities.

There should be mixed housing in terms of affordability and style, all should be well designed, and very energy efficient (mandatory for the builder/developer). We feel that a targeted approach should be strongly considered (see response to Question 4.2). A possible site for such a development is adjacent to Kings Hill.

The countryside around us is beautiful and should be preserved for future generations.

There's lots of disused land that is available. Unfortunately, there's a practice where developers purchase land and hoard for long periods of time.

This should be heavily taxed to force their hand to build new residential / commercial properties and free up land for people to do self builds. Self-builds are much more popular in other counties. If we could free up land by discouraging bad practice then this could change.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in the current local plan.

It is important that development is focussed on existing urban spaces and does not encroach on AONB or green belt in order to safeguard our environment

It is vital to retain and respect the green belt boundaries to avoid completely ruining the ability to grow our own crops in these difficult times where food production is becoming a very large and important part of our economy and well being.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and

---

**User Response: Text**

deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Much infrastructure will already be in place or be able to be increased sustainably.

Greenbelt is about openness and preventing coalescence of settlements. Will harm views of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

New dwellings will be near to facilities - shops, churches schools, libraries etc, minimising use of cars. But people in each community are still within reach of countryside.

The reasoning is that the drive for increased housing should be met by modest expansion of existing development areas. The opportunity to implant key infrastructure requirement can be more easily met in this way.

If key infrastructure resources are centred in and around areas of greatest population then the requirement to travel is reduced with all the attendant benefits of lower overall impact.

I am keen to preserve the patchwork of villages, countryside and open spaces .

Once these areas are built upon they are lost, for everybody, for ever

I do not feel that by making a beautiful village a built up housing estate is right for the future. This will totally spoil the green belt land for not only those living in the area but also wildlife. It's the most ridiculous idea! Why is it even considered healthy for the environment to increase the housing

Focus please

This option provides a reasonable balance whilst concentrating development in places that easier to service with public transport and other environmentally sustainable resourcing.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

---

**User Response: Text**

Keep the housing in areas already urban and have the facilities, eg schools, medical, shops, and transport links

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

To continue to expand Tonbridge will radically and detrimentally alter its character as a market town as well as adding pressure to services within the town (education, medical, transport) which are unlikely to be met from existing infrastructure. The pressure on infrastructure is already apparent - a broken down vehicle or single temporary traffic light on the A26 creates havoc. Adding several thousand new houses to the area is untenable without dramatic investment in e.g. public transport (and a dramatic reduction in fares to make it an attractive option) - this is unrealistic.

The Green Belt should be considered sacrosanct in the plan - it is a priority for many residents (74% of residents in the South of England are against building on the Green Belt - Ipsos Mori polling 2015: <https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/migrations/en-uk/files/Assets/Docs/Polls/cpre-green-belt-tables-aug-2015.pdf>)

I believe that this approach will help reduce urban sprawl, encourage redevelopment of otherwise undesirable urban land, help keep traffic volumes under control by distributing load, and prevent many historic local towns from merging.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

---

**User Response: Text**

TMBC Northeast part of Borough, Medway Gap and Valley including Aylesford Parish will be adversely affected by all of the options, the least bad option being 4 without considering moving green Belt boundaries.

Greenbelt and areas of outstanding natural beauty should not be compromised.

I chose this option 1 largely because it is mostly outside the highest flood risk area, which is Tonbridge. Snodland is also high flood risk, but there was no perfect choice for me, as all options also included Snodland. I just don't think it fair to build homes that have an ever increasing risk of being flooded.

Keep green belt at all costs

Greater spread of new development across the region

Predominantly I think it is essential that we preserve our green spaces, trees and areas of natural beauty. There are plenty of spaces to build that don't require trees to be cut down and wild life habitat to be destroyed

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- c) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- d) to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by the Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

---

**User Response: Text**

Congestion and impact on the rural surroundings is already at its limit in Tonbridge and the surrounding villages. Too many merge in to each other already and traffic is high. Quality of life and access to the rural areas is reduced further with every new development that is approved.

The borough is a mainly rural one with approximately 70% of the area being green belt. Whilst that may present some challenges in terms of planning, it is also the main reason that people choose to live and work here. Once the green belt is lost it will be impossible to regain it. Concreting over large areas and the area becoming congested and polluted will not be sustainable either for existing or future residents.

Any spatial strategy based on expanding the current urban centres can only work if there is significant investment in infrastructure, especially roads and water/drainage systems. The A228 that runs past Kings Hill and down to the A26 is single carriageway and inadequate for the current levels of traffic, and dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. It is frequently blocked, with long queues during morning and evening rush hours. This results in vehicles crawling along with their engines running, releasing high levels of carbon into the atmosphere and reducing the air quality for those who live nearby. The sewage system is also inadequate, with frequent overflows. Option 4 offers a more distributed strategy that would avoid exacerbating the current problems.

I have selected this option (5) as I do not believe it is possible to achieve the aims as stated via any of the other options and their competing interests.

If the figure of 15,941 is to actually be achieved (It should be resisted), then it will require a new settlement and the release of some greenbelt/rural land.

Option 2 allows development to be focused within the most sustainable locations providing good connections to supporting infrastructure and transport.

Option 1 fails to deliver housing to the southern HMA and should be ruled out for this reason.

Option 3 and 4 spreads development over rural service centres and rural settlements, that are unlikely to provide essential supporting infrastructure and represents the most unsustainable solution to meeting the need.

Option 5 does not provide an indication of the location of a potential new settlement so it is impossible to determine this as being the best option to meet the need. Furthermore, new settlements rely on enabling infrastructure which will likely result in considerable delay and issues of viability which may risk the Local Plan being found sound at examination.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;



---

**User Response: Text**

(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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

It would have a negative effect on residents' wellbeing if Rural Settlements were developed to the extent of becoming part of the Urban Sprawl. If development starts to join existing settlements together, they will lose their identities & character. It is also of great importance to maintain as much as possible of our own food production, I am not pro the use of agricultural land if possible; we need to feed our residents as well as house them.

Option 1) concentrates the developments mainly in one area only

Option 2) again is restricted in the areas targeted for development

Option 3) provides a better, wider distribution of development targeted at continued development in previously developed areas without damage to the environment of previously undeveloped areas.

Option 4) does provide for a better, wider distribution of development but may have a greater adverse environmental impact.

Option 5) again does provide for a better wider distribution of development but would have the greatest adverse environmental impact especially on AONB.

I expect that none of these options will be chosen as they stand but a mixture of them. My personal choice would be a combination of options 3 & 5 without development into Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Good Arable Agricultural land.

Maintain green belt

Support the key elements I have identified as far as is possible

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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

---

**User Response: Text**

e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing green belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the towns inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells BC in their current local plan

The focus should be on existing Towns + Kings Hill with some modest infill development within existing Villages. The need to ensure that Kings Hill cannot be seen from the Medway Valley, is something that I feel strongly about.

it focuses development on current urban areas and maintains the rural nature of the rest of the borough.

It also takes some pressure from the northern end of the borough spreading development more equitably throughout

Maximises use of existing infrastructure and doesn't impinge on Greenbelt or AONB.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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;
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. There is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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

---

**User Response: Text**

encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

It is considered the Local Plan should comprise a hybrid of spatial options 3 - 5. This will ensure that development needs are met across the whole borough area and in both Housing Market Areas. The 2no. HMA's relate to the Tunbridge Wells/Sevenoaks HMA as well as the Maidstone HMA. It will be important housing is met in response to needs across the whole borough (Options 1 and 2 do not achieve this).

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPFF

- 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

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing greenbelt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the towns inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells BC in the current local plan

We should endeavour to prevent development on greenbelt and greenfield as well as on premium agricultural land.

We should endeavour to prevent the merging of villages and towns to protect their identity and in some cases, their historical nature and character

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

To minimise the pressures on roads and cut through lanes during the busy times of the day and thereby limit the pollution caused by queuing traffic. It would also help to prevent gridlock situations in the towns and built up areas.

---

**User Response: Text**

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Any of these answers is unclear as to what that actually covers in terms of green spaces, I would hope that it's just pure brown land that is built on and trees and green spaces were saved.

the Tonbridge and malling ancient woodland inventory 2010 states that The south east has approx 80% of ancient woodland but is under threat from development pressure. This reason alone should mean this area should be left alone.

These areas are home to protected slowworm plus bats, nightjars, doormouse, grass snakes, owls, woodpeckers and many other species

Road safety and parking would become an even bigger issue to roads

-there are a number of brownfield sites already earmarked for development to satisfy house building 'targets' namely the Broadwater site. Shouldn't this mean that areas that provide a home for the above species and could raise all the issues mentioned be left alone?

Kings hill was built with the intention of providing residents with the type of living That takes advantage Of the gorgeous outside space that surrounds it. Slowly losing that outside space defeats the objective of enjoying the nature That surrounds us.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

I don't agree with any of these distributions because none of them offer to not over develop Kings Hill. All of these strategies class Kings Hill wrongly as an Urban area (which it is not and neither do residents want it to be) and all strategies involve over developing this village. This is purely money led. Kings Hill is not urban and does

---

**User Response: Text**

not have sufficient infrastructure to support new homes. It's already impossible to get GP apts, people are having to travel to other villages to get seen by Drs because our surgery is so over subscribed, all the primary schools are full, there is no secondary school, there are not enough community spaces and your plan is to build over the ones that are there.

It is very important to me that the option taken protects green belt and protected land. Once this land has been built on, it is very difficult to get back.

This option also builds homes close to many existing amenities.

The Green Belt needs to be protected for future generations so developments need to be focused on brownfield sites within Urban Areas.

This means not building on green belt land in and around the villages.

It is important to respect Green Belt and AONB to protect the openness of the countryside and prevent urban sprawl.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Green belt land and AONBs should be protected while there are sufficient brownfield sites available for significant numbers of affordable housing, with good transport connections and access to schools and healthcare. With buildings such as commercial premises and offices standing empty in many central urban areas, there are opportunities for creating apartments in these areas with access to central transport hubs. Eating into the green belt will mean the loss of valuable farmland, wildlife habitat and natural spaces and amenities for residents.

Prefer option 1 but every community needs some housing so option 4 has some credit.

green belt land is not a reusable commodity ....if it goes it will never come back.

It is important to retain the metropolitan green belt and areas of AONB in order to preserve the character and attraction of the region.

---

**User Response: Text**

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.

Green belt should not be included for building as it is the lungs of the community. Crowded housing requires residents to have a place of beauty to recharge their batteries to continue as public citizens, police, medical professionals, teachers, emergency workers all human beings !

Green belt should remain green belt

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan

Options 4 and 5 because there simply is the infrastructure in place to the East of the Borough to support Options 1, 2 and 3.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The option that protects wildlife and doesn't create sprawl. We should not be damaging our environment any further.

---

**User Response: Text**

Only build where the housing is needed.

Internal migration should not be encouraged. Why build so that people can move to the area from houses elsewhere.

Greenbelt should be retained as one lost cannot be recovered. Narrow lanes in smaller villages aren't suitable for increased traffic.

Larger developments should be sustainable therefore within easy access walking distance local public transport services. Major infrastructure improvements will be required, therefore developing within some of these rural areas will not be sustainable or viable financially due to the infrastructure requirements.

If such rural communities are selected within the LP. Polices need to protect and improve local bus services and should not be subject to alteration or cancellation after construction has been completed.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing green belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the towns inhabitants

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells BC in their current local plan.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever

To meet the housing needs whilst minimizing the impact on the countryside & green areas, but acknowledging that there will be some required impact on green belt to best utilize exiasting infrastructure. Whilst option 1 is appealing to avoid green belt completely, I worry that this option could place too much pressure on schools, health, transport etc in one area - whereas leveraging areas such as Tonbridge should mean less impact and a more scalable approach.

It should be the case that if there is space for development to adjoin or extend from existing, larger settlements, then those should be considered in the first instance. This is due to more developed infrastructure and transport links already being present, and a reduced chance of adverse impact on environmentally and policy constrained land. It would also assist in preserving the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

In addition, there are limited transport links or room for significant expansion of infrastructure to support development in rural areas of the borough, without significant adverse impacts on biodiversity, landscape

---

**User Response: Text**

character, air quality, cultural heritage, and openness of the Green Belt – as the sustainability appraisal makes clear.

The sustainability appraisal further supports the economic case for spatial options 2 and 3, and lesser negative impacts on significant areas of environmental concern.

Development should not be permitted in Rural Areas (option 5) – this would cause significant harm to the countryside, and on people’s health and wellbeing who currently reside in these areas, which are widely used for leisure and recreation. In addition, building on grade 1 agricultural land would harm the rural economy.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

I feel that green belt is sacrosanct. It was established for a purpose and should not be adjusted now that it is inconvenient. I appreciate that this presents a challenge whereby new housing has to be concentrated in existing urban areas - but the lack of availability of non- green belt should be part of the reason for challenging the top down allocation of housing by the govt.

Keeping as much green belt land as possible to ensure wildlife

Infrastructure is already in place and can be extended. Rural areas often lack basic infrastructure.

Land in Greenbelt and AONB should be protected and not developed on.

It is more cost effective to build in or close to existing developed areas where infrastructure already exists.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.



---

**User Response: Text**

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Greenbelt land must not be lost. Development must be prioritised on the most urban areas.

By selecting option 1 this keeps developments within areas already built with existing infrastructure.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Leave the villages well alone! People choose to live in villages to get away from housing estates. Please continue to develop current housing estates which have the appropriate road networks and infrastructure!

---

**User Response: Text**

The Green Belt and the AONB have been designated as such as they have been deemed worthy of protection, and are unique landscapes. Once they have been developed they will be gone with no way of replacing them. They are what makes the Borough the area that it is and must remain protected.

use brown sites first.

I live in the village of Hildenborough and the village cannot sustain any major development that will put a strain on already maxed out infrastructure.

New development needs to be concentrated where there are already good communication and services. Adding significant growth to villages with established heritage buildings and communities would be very difficult without changing their character. A small number of houses that compliment the local environment and meet local needs would be welcomed.

Expansion beyond existing green belts boundaries is going to result in further congestion especially if the developments in Tudeley and Paddock Wood go ahead. You cannot get into Tonbridge in the mornings as it is.

Infrastructure already in place but recognise this would have to be expanded. It would also protect the green belt which is important with an increased population. There would also be less impact on biodiversity and ecological issues

Going further than this would impact on green belt or AONB spaces. We are fortunate to have land that has been protected from major development and it is essential that it is protected. Otherwise the door to even greater encroachment and damage to habitat would be likely to be opened.

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever

To me this strategy option makes the most sense as it focuses development close to where the majority of services and infrastructure are located. Developing areas adjacent to communities lower down the Settlement Hierarchy would require significant investment especially in terms of infrastructure including roads, schools, doctor's surgeries, sewage works etc

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions.

---

**User Response: Text**

23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Most importantly though, the Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty need to be protected more than ever. While I understand the need for housing, there is a climate crisis and our green spaces should be sacrosanct.

Retention of the village identities, green belt and AONB

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF

1 - to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build up areas

2 to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

3. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

4 to preserve the setting & special character of historic towns

5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, P Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B C in their current local plan.

It is vital to protect the Greenbelt and AONB from development. Protecting areas of outstanding natural beauty is sacrosanct, as once it is gone, it will be lost forever.

Protecting our AONB is covered by Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of way Act 2000 (the statutory duty of regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty).

There is much more suitable land available outside the AONB in the Borough. No allocations should be made in the AONB or its setting.

Taking Tonbridge by way of example, there would seem to be large areas that could be developed via creation of a couple of multi story car parks / underground parking, with freed up areas being developed.

### Green Belt

Building houses alone, should not constitute exceptional circumstances

The government has not set out to redefine the policy considerations in respect of Green Belt so there is a strong case to argue that Green Belt land should not be included in the local plan simply to satisfy government requirement for new homes.

---

**User Response: Text**

The policy planning department have confirmed to me that Of the initial 291 sites put forward, 174 are on Green Belt land. That gives 117 sites not on Green Belt land.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

This Option 1 should help protect the landscape of the greenbelt (one hopes) and also the areas outside of AONB which is to be preserved for future generations.

Need to focus development close to existing main settlements that have infrastructure in place and are sustainable - Tonbridge is ideal for this

The expansion will lead to more traffic, pollution and wildlife will be disturbed

The expansion will lead to more traffic and the wildlife will be disturbed. We have bats and badgers in the vicinity.

I have chosen this strategy because I believe it makes logical sense to build developments where there are good

---

**User Response: Text**

existing travel, medical and educational links, not build in villages where transport and road links are inadequate for more developments, and also to keep our open fields and green belt land to ensure we have this land available in years to come for farming for our future generations.

As per comment above - sorry didn't see this field.

Around me - Kings Hill / West Malling there has been a disproportionate amount of development relative to the rest of Kent. Present infrastructure cannot cope with the demand. New developments should be spread across Kent in brownfield / non-green belt land and supported by infrastructure improvements to cope.

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up area.

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

To preserve the setting and the special character of historic towns.

To assist in urban regeneration, by the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration of the quality of life for the towns inhabitants.. There are already severe consequences pending from the nearby developments in Tudeley/Capel and Paddock Wood arising from the Tunbridge Wells Local Plan.

Option 1 allows for the extension of existing urban areas where there is already a supporting infrastructure while preserving the Green Belt and areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF;

(a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas ;

(b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

---

**User Response: Text**

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the towns inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B. C. in their current local plan.

I have selected option 1 with reservations. I feel the starting point should be to protect all the Green Belt, AONB, woodland, SSSIs, RIGS, biodiversity, etc that exist in our borough. However, the pressure to meet housing demand in urban areas may require the development of small pockets of green belt land around selected urban areas, thus incorporating aspects of options 2 & 3.

There is a reason that the Greenbelt was established. It is essential that it is preserved because once it has gone it can never be retrieved. Developments should be concentrated outside of greenbelt and greenfield sites and never on grade 1 agricultural land. Building on it will cause neighbourhoods and villages to merge. Historic towns have special character which is easily destroyed by massive housing projects. Homes should be built in already urban areas that will have the facilities required, for example schools, doctor's surgeries, hospitals, shops and recreation facilities

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Development should be focussed outside of areas marked as Greenbelt and AONB. Once these areas are encroached then it will set a precedent that allows further development in the future and their gradual erosion.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

---

## User Response: Text

- 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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Allowing development of vacant plots along the main access roads to all three settlements - ribbon development - will only hasten the three towns merger into one wide spread development with no clear town centre.

We wish to protect Green Belt and AONB and concur with NPPF (July 2021)

Para 137 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.

Para 176 Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONB which has the highest status of protection in relation to planning issues. *No allocations should be made in AONB*

The following key points are some of the reasons why only Option 1 fulfills the NPPF policies:

In accordance with the NPPF (para 72), local planning authorities should support the development of entry-level exception sites, suitable for first time buyers (or those looking to rent their first home), unless the need for such homes is already being met within the authority's area. These sites should be on land which is not already allocated for housing and should...

be adjacent to existing settlements, **proportionate in size to them, not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance in this Framework...**

Entry-level exception sites should not be permitted in National Parks (or within the Broads Authority), **Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or land designated as Green Belt.**)

NPPF (para 137) The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl...

1. a) to **check the unrestricted sprawl** of large built-up areas;
2. b) to **prevent neighbouring towns merging** into one another;
3. c) to assist in **safeguarding the countryside** from encroachment;

---

**User Response: Text**

4. d) to **preserve the setting and special character of historic towns**; and
5. e) to **assist in urban regeneration**, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

NPPF (para 147) **Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt** and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

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.

NPPF (para 176) **Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.** The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.

**When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.**

For these key reasons, only Option 1 fulfills the NPPF policies.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
5. assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality . The Green belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

The green belt and areas of outstanding natural beauty should be preserved to protect nature biodiversity help stop pollution , this would keep nature and ourselves happy and healthier.

we need to maintain the greenbelt areas and avoid over development of the existing towns and villages thereby



---

**User Response: Text**

avoiding putting a strain on the existing resources.

To avoid making towns into cities then joining them all up into one big sprawling city.

Continued expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing greenbelt boundaries will lead to extreme congestion and deterioration of the quality of life for Tonbridge residents.

**Protecting Green Belt**

It enables concentration of local services to a critical mass, and should be more economical in ensuring that the infrastructure Investment is effective. The greater dispersal of developments will change the feel of the area to urban rather than rural.

however none of the options are acceptable unless the medical, educational, transport and employment can be met in a timely way. Currently it's difficult to see that happening in the timescale of the plan

I think it is important to spread development out and NOT have it all concentrated in 1 area. (ie No to a Borough green garden city plan). I think it is also important for residents to be able to access work and life using public transport or sustainable transport. These main centres nearly all have access to railway services. School age/ college children and young people should be able to get to schools easily. This is simply not possible in rural communities where roads are unsuitable for walking or cycling.

The same as my previous answer. It shares out the development more evenly, which prevents the rural communities being left behind and the more developed areas becoming too densely populated and busy.

I think avoiding development of green belt land should be key. However, I do think that development within the centre of Tonbridge and other rural areas which are not green belt in addition is sensible.

We need to maintain the greenbelt areas and avoid over development of the existing towns and villages thereby avoiding putting a strain on the existing resources.

This option appears at face value to protect the green belt and rural / semi rural nature of parts of the Borough. Other options appear to advocate simply bulldozing a ring around each existing settlement to create development space, regardless of the impact on communities.

---

### User Response: Text

No option meets the sustainability requirements, as there is no plan to ensure infrastructure, including adequate roads and active transport and health service, is in place PRIOR to building houses.

The continuous development around existing settlements without adequate uplift in infrastructure, such as parking, has meant that additional development would be unsustainable. The concentration, based on avoiding green belt where possible, on the best agricultural area in the borough is inappropriate, and an overall review of approach is critical.

Summary: Infrastructure needs to be in-place before building is started.

#### Option 1

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is built over

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option does not address the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of the developer. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area so should not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

#### Option 2

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is built over

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of the developer. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

---

### User Response: Text

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area so should not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

#### Option 3

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of the developer. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

#### Option 4

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is potential to be built over

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The continual recent development around village centres has meant that most are already overloaded and struggling and more such development will exacerbate the situation.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of the developer. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

#### Option 5

A new town would become an urban area and would require pre-implementation of infrastructure. It does not seem that TMBC are willing to put in such investment. In addition, much of the land would be more costly for developers to develop, and would likely only be accepted if there was no alternative. In addition, the road network should be the primary focus for development to ensure that adequate connectivity to service centres was provided. Likewise, new connectivity for water, gas and electricity would need to be implemented. There was brownfield land in green belt that was assigned in the previous (withdrawn) local plan, and that should be re-considered, even given the constraints identified here.

---

### User Response: Text

No option meets the sustainability requirements as there is no plan to ensure infrastructure, including adequate roads and active transport and health service is in place PRIOR to building houses.

Much of the increase relates to high price / earnings ratio which is primarily associated with the Tonbridge region. It does not apply to Kings Hill. Disproportionate amount of new housing has been built in and around Kings Hill and West Malling. The instructions associated with the uplift are that the intention is for brownfield sites in urban areas to be used for the uplift. The plans are not consistent with the government guidelines. Brownfield sites should be a priority such as the sand pits around Borough Green and other areas around Tonbridge.

A substantial amount of development over the last few decades has been around existing towns and villages with limited enhancement of resources placing significant and extensive pressures on these resources.

Kings Hill is not urban and its infrastructure is at breaking point already. **A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green space. The transport link and essential services ( in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any additional development.** Kings Hill cannot sustain any further development and has already vastly exceeded its original allocation. Further expansion takes it off its existing already over built up brownfield site allocation and intrudes on valuable natural assets, valuable agricultural land and contributes to coalescence of communities.

I repeat previous comments:-

I see nothing here regarding the service levels required to sustain and support new building initiatives. At present there are hardly enough doctors taking on new patients. There are hardly no dentists providing National Health coverage. The roads into and out of Tonbridge are snarled-up during mornings and evenings.

There is poor water pressure. There isn't enough water available in the reservoirs etc. Sewage is already being discharged into the sea and rivers.

This is the situation now. How will adding more houses improve the situation?

Typically locations already subject to significant development already have far better developed infrastructure and amenities and are more able to cope with additional residences. Development in more rural areas has a disproportionate impact on local facilities and services when compared to more urban locations.

Option 1 should help to protect the green belt and also the Areas of Natural beauty.

The strategy's focus should be brownfield sites and urban regeneration outside greenfield/greenbelt areas and most definitely not on Kent's high-grade agricultural land which is critically important for contributing to England's food security post-Brexit. Furthermore, it is vital to safeguard the boundaries and historic character of local towns and villages.

---

**User Response: Text**

Given the requirements of the NPPF that green belt land is to be developed only in exceptional circumstances and then only with clear and full justification, Option 1 is the preferred solution for the borough's housing requirements, at least for the short/medium term given the opportunity and preference to focus on regenerating or recycling urban land, particularly PDL. Moreover, the green belt areas around Tonbridge serve to ensure other requirements such as preventing unnecessary 'urban sprawl' and safeguarding the future of the countryside (incl. grade 1/2 agricultural land), ensuring biodiversity and minimising future carbon emissions from avoidable development of previously designated green belt.

Even if there were a strong case for considering such green belt land for development, in areas such as north-east Tonbridge / Higham / Hadlow, such development would put strain on and congest an already busy single main A26 route as well as other services, transport and infrastructure; which itself is already under major threat from the Capel / Tudeley developments that Tunbridge Wells B.C is seeking to progress to the detriment of T&M population.

It would seem there has been significant and positive investment in areas such as the Medway Gap, providing much needed affordable housing, schools, medical etc with major transport links (M20 and mainline rail routes) which offer significant additional capacity for the foreseeable future, to meet a material % of expected housing demand.

The greenfield sites are of fundamental importance to psychological wellbeing and should not be built upon where alternative brownfield sites exist. Also, the agricultural land in my area is of very high quality (grade 1) and should be preserved for food production.

TMBC have a duty of care to existing residents to ensure that AONB, Green Belt areas, and areas of Sites Special Scientific Interest are protected. Once these areas are gone they are gone forever. Everything must be done to secure and preserve environmental biodiversity.

Furthermore TMBC has an equal responsibility to protect the Health and the Mental Health of residents. Loss of views, loss of light, loss of services resulting through new builds and overly large extensions to existing housing stock has a negative effect on a person's sense of well-being.

MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge and other areas beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

---

**User Response: Text**

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The countryside should take priority and the character of the area should not be sacrificed

The hierarchy of settlement is too rigid, all communities need to be able to accommodate change and individual merit should apply to applications and selection of sites. The proposed frameworks only hinder this. This mitigates against development rather than seeing development as an opportunity to improve people's lives. Our duty is to improve the lives of those who have less good fortune or are vulnerable as well as preserve the landscape and create a sustainable future. We can accommodate more development without it being detrimental to current communities, in fact development done well is a positive for the community and the landscape. The English landscape has always changed.

The Green Belt must be respected and preserved to maintain the known health benefits, both mental and physical, of exercise in green space.

We also need to retain the ability to provide local food, especially given an increasingly uncertain global supply. In any case, we should be looking to reduce food miles in order to reduce CO2 emissions.

Development in existing urban centres makes sense because of the ready availability of services, such as public transport.

Strategy 2 avoids building on the countryside, which spoils the character of the general environment. There is a need for social housing and that can most easily be satisfied with relatively high-density developments in more-urban areas.

Adding 16,000 homes in a borough that starts with c60,000 is an increase of c30%. Focusing this entirely on a few urban centres will significantly change the nature of those centres. Option 4 provides more opportunity to distribute the increase evenly across the borough.

Focused improvements on infrastructure rather than spreading development and not being able to improve

---

**User Response: Text**

infrastructure over wider area. Council has already demonstrated that it can not bring about public transport provision for all areas E.g. bus subsidies cuts to rural services by KCC

I do not prefer any other the spatial strategy options as presented as they all, in some form, call for further development around Kings Hill which is now been classified as a "urban" settlement. Kings Hill was always intended to stay within the bounds of the former West Malling airfield and this principle should be prioritised. Any further development around Kings Hill margins would significantly encroach on East Malling, West Malling and the smaller hamlet settlements situated near by and would destroy valuable farmland and countryside so must be avoided.

Brownfield site development is significantly more preferable to the loss of further soil resources.

Greenbelt should not be used for new housing. Once built on we can never get it back. What's the point of greenbelt land if it is just built over?

Green Belt has been established for a reason. This does not change.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Given current climate issues and the war in Ukraine I do not think it is wise to build on our Green spaces or indeed on good Agricultural Land, I do not want to see villages and towns linked together by new housing and am therefore opted to any development that aims to do this.

None of the above are suitable for Tonbridge area as the existing infrastructure and NHS servies. we already have problems relating to this.

---

**User Response: Text**

Would not like any additional house to be built in Kingshill area

Development within the existing restrictions of Green Belt and near to AONB provide an environment for everyone to access and from which benefit is achieved in a rural setting where they have chosen to live.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Development should be concentrated on brownfield sites and other previously developed areas. The fundamental objectives of the green belt are to "stop urban sprawl" by protecting the countryside from encroachment and maintaining village boundaries. Green belt sites and in particular greenfield green belt sites that have specific qualities, such as good quality agricultural land, are in a setting that assists with preserving the special character of historic towns and villages, and/or are outside of the current development envelope are examples of sites that should not under any circumstances be considered viable for development.

Given the breadth of sites identified, there can be no justification of turning over green belt or other 'protected' land for development- there are no exceptional circumstances. Moreover, focussing the growth towards the north of the borough nearer to the borough's boundary would have the potential of limiting the impact on T&M. Tunbridge Wells BC have already used this strategy in Capel.

Greenbelt land and AONB should be protected and not developed.

Kent is already over populated and the infrastructure for road transport is not meeting current requirements.

Development should only take place where infrastructure already exists. This makes it much more cost effective.

Prevent neighbouring settlements merging into one settlement, encroachment on green spaces between them and destroying historic character

To avoid neighbouring towns merging which would create sprawl and thereby change the special historic character of our towns.

In order to avoid reduction of the Green Belt areas and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and to concentrate



---

**User Response: Text**

new development within or adjacent to existing urban areas thus using existing services, transport links and roads.

First and foremost developing on green belt is not desirable as a matter of principle. The creation of green belts are protected by statute for a very good reason - to prevent urban sprawl. However, preferring option 3 to option 1 is on the assumption that modest, proportionate development in rural service centres will bring back lost services. If that is not the case then option 1 is preferred. On the other hand as mentioned above continuing development at Kings Hill as a special case - an ongoing new town - makes option 2 a better preference. I would not favour options 4 or 5 at all, both of which are at odds with preserving the green belt which should be the #1 priority (along of course with the AONB and of scientific interest and the other special areas).

I believe that the Green Belt is absolutely irreplaceable and that it should be respected, maintained and prioritised above all else. Between now and 2040, there will inevitably be incidents of individuals requesting planning permission to develop land that falls within the Green Belt, but on a very small scale, and in ways which add to the total count of new homes being created, whilst having minimal impact on their immediate locality eg. division/extension of one dwelling to create two dwellings, conversion of outbuilding to granny annexe etc. The creation of new dwellings in such a way can be taken into account when attempting to meet government targets for the number of new homes, so I do not consider it necessary to deliberately ear-mark any areas that fall within the Green Belt.

**5** There is a greater distribution of housing across the borough which may also allow for different kinds of living. Some areas will be more affordable than high prices centres of previous development like Kings Hill. Some people prefer to live in less developed areas and may offer opportunities for more small communities to arise.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan

Protection of green belt areas should be most important as once lost it will never be replaced.

---

**User Response: Text**

Risk of over populating already densely populated areas

All options unfairly target Snodland and The Medway Gap for huge increases in houses and not a lot else.

Option 3 is the only option that appears to at least consider a more varied mixture of sites.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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
- e) to assist in urban regeneration but encouraging recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing green belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for residents. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending developments nearby in Tudeley and Paddock Wood proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

This takes the pressure off the already developed and therefore overstretched areas. Schools, gp and roads are already at capacity.

The existence of an AONB designation should be considered at the very outset in plan preparation and should influence the plan in terms of the spatial strategy for the Borough.

National policy is clear that allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value (counting the AONB as high value), that planning policies should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and that development within AONBs should be limited in scale. It would be inappropriate for the Council's general housing need to be met within the AONB. However, growth of some villages, local centres and rural service centres within the AONB may be appropriate within or adjacent to the AONB, especially where this provides affordable housing, depending on the scale of development proposed and the landscape capacity of specific sites.

AONB setting issues also affect a significant area within the Borough. A large swathe of the Vale of Holmesdale lies within the Borough – this is the valley that lies at the foot of the North Downs and incorporates the A20/M20, M26 and M25 corridors and is an area identified as being where development and changes to the landscape where the setting of the Kent Downs AONB may be more keenly felt. Impacts on the setting of the Kent Downs AONB therefore also needs to be carefully considered and should influence the Spatial Strategy for the Borough.

For potential allocations within the AONB and its setting, we would recommend that the Council considers landscape capacity studies in order to assess the suitability of sites to accommodate development and any mitigation that may be required. Development within the AONB is more likely to be appropriate where it is

---

**User Response: Text**

small scale and complementary to local character in form, setting, scale, design, materials and settlement pattern.

Options 5, 4 and to a lesser extent 3 would appear to have most potential to adversely impact on the Kent Downs AONB, therefore Option 1 is the AONB Unit's preferred Spatial Strategy option, followed by Option 2.

The start of this section prejudices what the strategy should be, stating in paragraph 4.2.1 the need to protect natural assets and that all the identified designations, including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be avoided as far as possible. This is against the background where none of the options put forward for comment by the Council, allow consideration to amending the Green Belt.

All of the Council's options in the Reg 18 draft only involve allowing development within urban areas and adjacent to settlements on greenfield land (with the possible exception of Option 5, where that is also the case, but with the potential addition of a new settlement(s)).

Whilst that is arguably the right approach for housing, the Council's eventual policies in a new Local Plan should not rule out the use of previously developed land for other forms of development.

Therefore, which ever option the Council pursues, it should only apply to new housing development and the policies should be explicit to make that clear.

A distributed approach would result in some development and growth being applied to every settlement across the Borough. This is a fair way of sharing the load and provides the opportunity for each settlement irrespective of size to evolve and grow organically and to sustain the existing community. By utilising the full spectrum of the settlement hierarchy it provides the Council with as much choice as possible as regards location where growth can be accommodated.

Imperative to protect the Greenbelt and AONB

There should not be unrestricted sprawl. The countryside should be protected. Tonbridge has been selected by residents due to its character and size. There should be regeneration not continual expansion into the Green Belt.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Minimise impact on the green belt and exploit the services and resources associated with the urban centres.

---

**User Response: Text**

The character of the village should be retained.

Greenbelt and AONB areas should be retained and respected.

This strategy

- Is not harmful to the countryside and our special villages
- Preserves the character of our unique historic towns and villages
- Best preserves against urban sprawl & Prevents Ightham and Borough Green from merging
- Safeguards the countryside, AONB and Green Belt
- Prevents towns and villages encroaching on the countryside
- Provides development which is most appropriate and proportionate to the local area

see comments above

I feel Kent is over-populated already so would oppose most new home building but given we have to build some if you already live in a massively developed area already you probably wouldn't notice some new houses but a village/hamlet would be ruined and gone forever.

It is preferable to focus development in or around existing urban settlements, utilising and enhancing the infrastructure and services within those settlements, preserving the green belt and surrounding countryside

As said previously the joining of two or more large urban areas that should already have reasonable infrastructure will allow the Green Belt/ AONB to be preserved.

Has the least impact on the Greenbelt and AONB's, in line with the vision of valuing the environment.

Preservation of Green Belt land. Development more focused so appropriate infrastructure can be put in place.

It keeps development to those areas where hopefully the infrastructure is there to support it.

Green Belt land should be preserved as far as possible and in accordance with point 4.2.2 of the TMBC vision

---

**User Response: Text**

and with the original purpose of the law.

The focus should be on PDL and brownfields with increasing urban or near-urban **vertical** developments (i.e. high-rise flats), just like in continental Europe. This offers advantages in terms of the use of more shared/common infrastructure

Opportunity to enable wider development in the Borough. Developments in locations near to service hubs would potentially utilise and develop existing infrastructure. Other minor developments acceptable such as in Villages with the proviso that the character, amenity, and green space between locations are maintained.

It is important to retain rural areas as 'green' and allow development in urban areas

There are plenty of brownfield sites around the county , use these! The rural character of our villages need to be preserved!! Not just fir residents but for those that use it fir recreation.

Does not infringe green belt

The aim should be to remain the character of the region and not to conjest it.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

To preserve the green belt and the adjoining countryside.

Believe we should not be impacting significantly on Green Belt including agricultural land. It makes sense to

---

**User Response: Text**

develop around existing conurbations which already have the requisite infrastructure.

I would prefer to protect the green belt but realise that reduces planning flexibility considerably. The next best approach is therefore to add to existing towns where infrastructure is already in place and accessibility assured. Without infrastructure you will require properties to be fuelled by oil heating, for example.

Developing in areas which already have access to transport/educational and medical services makes more sense. The east bank of the river relies too heavily on services outside of the borough i.e Maidstone and Medway hospitals, secondary schools etc and would require a huge amount of infrastructure improvement to accommodate any more development.

However, I feel Snodland has already been over-developed with little regard to ensuring adequate infrastructure, economic opportunity or quality of life.

The green belt and the Kent downs area of outstanding beauty is extremely important for the environment

For the simple reason that urban areas already have the services required to support developments i.e roads, public services, bus routes etc

Rural areas are losing these facilities and by developing these areas will only stretch further what little public services they have

The Metropolitan Green Belt around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the National Planning Policy Framework: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

I think that AONB and Greenbelt are absolutely central and so very important to preserve - for reasons of biodiversity, preserving a mix of natural environments from farming land to woodlands, diverse environments including the north downs and the greensand hills, all of which support animals, insects and flora and trees; It is paramount that we preserve protected natural spaces like this for these areas are critical in the battle against climate change. Natural species thrive and ensure natural diversity that is critical to the future. Greenbelt additionally serves a lung for London as well as supports mental wellbeing for those travelling from London to be able to enjoy it.

---

**User Response: Text**

So concentrating building on urban areas where development would be expected, where relatively comprehensive infrastructure exists would not be unexpected. This differs from option 1 in that it does recognise some building has to happen across the borough. Tonbridge seems to be able to accommodate new building relatively effectively and would balance the borough to some extent so new building is not all up in the north east. We see it as an important thriving town in the SW of the borough.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan

are your reasons for selecting this particular spatial strategy option for the  
Local Plan (outline briefly (max. 6000 characters))?

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will

---

**User Response: Text**

result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan

The green-belt landscape should be afforded the upmost protection. Such areas of open space are important to both human and wildlife wellbeing. Such areas are required to complement the areas of outstanding natural beauty and support the vital ecosystems and natural habitats for many protected species, they should not to be blighted by having hard boundaries created by development sites.

Th assessed housing need already is accomoodating unused planning permissions. completions have run behind release of planning permissions andthis is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

This option preserves the Green Belt, ANOB, conservation areas, rural communities and the beauty of our area. Many of these communities do not have the infra structure to sustain many new houses and the historic identity of our special villages will be lost for ever. Many villages do not have gas and the water supply is struggling. We do not have any shops, the bus service has been dramatically cut, the village school is over subscribed and the country roads are too narrow to contemplate cycling on regularly.

I am concerned that if development is focussed solely on urban areas, these areas will lose all their existing green space. I would also like the impact of homes being used as investments being investigated as this could release housing stock, although this is a national issue particularly in London where a lot of properties are just investments for the super rich.

New housing load spread across the borough.

To much development in the north of the borough, and now needs and new small town built with all new infrastructure, and roads to cope with it all.

The option chosen seemingly is the only one where marginally, the greenbelt, areas of natural of natural beauty and established local communities may be afforded some degree of protection from the onslaught of ever more housing developments.

We are already overcrowded in the South East as it is and are fast encroaching on our green belt land not only upsetting the biodiversity in the area but also fast chipping away at green spaces for the existing local community to enjoy. We don't want to be another satellite area of an ever expanding greater London. I don't want to live in a



---

**User Response: Text**

concrete jungle.

We are creating issues in respect of further flooding risks and subsidence in the area as it is, being largely built on clay.

The Borough currently has 130,000+ residents. The plan to add 10,000 plus more homes will greatly increase this number. We have an extensive road network, numerous motorways etc all of which have eaten into our green belt and AoB. Moving forward we should strive to maximise and maintain our greenbelt. Once lost it can never be reclaimed. It's needed for mental health and biodiversity.

Let's develop Brown Field sites and commercial property change of use long before we take the easy route of building on Green Field sites.

Minimise the impact on the green belt and AONB, exploit, enhance and expand the existing services and infrastructure already found in urban settings and minimise the risk of changing and damaging the character of more rural settings.

By pursuing Option1 the Sustainability Appraisal objectives by which sites can best be achieved through access to education and community facilities, proximity to public transport, through support of health and wellbeing and by protecting important health, environment, landscape and natural assets, valuing the district rural character of the area enjoyed by those living in both the Borough's towns and its villages. We should concentrate on development outside of greenfield and greenbelt sites and not on Grade 1 agricultural land.

We should prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another by maintaining village boundaries, assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment ,preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and assist in urban regeneration.

The other options[ albeit to a lesser extent Option2] would have a major impact on villages and in particular Offham including their rural character and landscape ,the health and wellbeing of local residents.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in the current plan

---

**User Response: Text**

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Conservation areas must be protected., Sites 59779,59825, 59827 should never have been included in the sustainability appraisal

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Green belt and AONB needs to be protected from being built on

Within areas of previous development and adjacent to rail connections

If these central government housing targets (which I do not agree with) have to be met, then I think it is impossible for TMBC to reasonably meet their target and leave the Green Belt untouched (too much density in the north east of the Borough). Given these caveats I reluctantly conclude that some encroachment on the Green

---

**User Response: Text**

Belt may be necessary, specifically around Tonbridge and Kings Hill.

The best way to preserve the rural history of the borough for future generations and improve biodiversity within the TMBC borough will be to enable the largest areas of undeveloped land to be link to assist connectivity within the landscape to aid the movement and recovery of habitats and ecosystems.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements setout in the NPPF:

- Prevent unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas,
- Prevent neighbouring towns merging,
- Safeguard the countryside from encroachment,
- Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns,
- Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land,

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Greenbelt is there to prevent urban sprawl and should be respected by this Local Plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF...

- 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
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. The pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by TWBC in their local plan will make this even more likely.

This option supports my feeling about concerning building links between remoter sites and the wider impact on the local communities and extra pressure on road use.

All options where the search for development space is concentrated around existing settlements can only exacerbate the pressure on infrastructure that is already creaking, so it makes sense for settlements to be spread

---

**User Response: Text**

around. One thing that should always be taken into account though is the impact on existing residents. Too often it appears that the cost and convenience of using existing residential roads and cul-de-sacs for access to new or larger developments is more important than protecting the environment for existing residents. It sometimes seems a bit like companies offering deals to new customers at the expense of its existing customers.

Expanding Tonbridge beyond the green belt will lead to further congestion on the roads which will lead to the deterioration of the quality of the lives of the people who live here. This is evidenced by the Paddock Wood site which is already under development and Tunbridge Wells BC are proising to include Tudeley in their current local plan

The land around kings hill and the Medway gap have significantly better connectivity in terms of both road and rail links. Those wishing to commute either to London or our county town of Maidstone have multiple options, thus dispersing the commuter traffic. They are areas very close to trunk routes and Motorways. The historical nature of Tonbridge means it cannot cope with the traffic we have, access to the A21 is already congested and there is little that can be done to alleviate this. Around Kings Hill there is a purpose build modern road infrastructure.

This seems the most logical option given the size of the current settlements in this strategy which have good rail/transport links and medical infrastructures in place plus decent road links.

Please see my related comment. Additionally, it has to be sensible to utilise existing infrastructure rather than creat more disruption. Clearly there is a capacity limit to this, so we will ultimately reach saturation point, when we simply have to say to Government, NO. The southeast is already a fairly densely populated area by comparison to other areas, so development should be easier elsewhere. Finally, we should now be clear just how important farm land is, the war in Ukraine has shown we are far to depended on other countries for food that we can and should be producing ourselves, wheat being a good example. So the last thing we should be doing now is building on farm land, we should be helping farmers produce more.

By selecting option 2 we will 'buy time' until the folly of this 'give up new land to concrete' way ahead is recognised as just that---sheer folly.

Concentrate on what is already built on. In particular any vacant and soon to be vacant retail space. Encourage developers to look with more attention at these 'old abandoned shops'.

In addition I see a pattern developing here. The Medway Gap 'falls between' the two HMA's mentioned. (Sevenoaks/Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells HMA; and the Maidstone HMA). Thus it is getting a disproportionate volume of planning applications approved.

Also there is a real slant/bias in keeping development as far away from Tonbridge as possible.

---

**User Response: Text**

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the MPPF

1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- 2.to prevent the neighbouring towns merging into one another
- 3.To assist in safeguarding the countryside against encroachment
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict or other urban land

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing green belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the towns inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments( Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by TW borough council in their current local plan

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF;

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddockwood ) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B. C. in their current local plan.

The natural beauty and open space of the county's countryside/ANOB/Greenbelt must be protected.

---

**User Response: Text**

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Continually building round and round existing settlements destroys the chosen environment for the people who already live there. One new settlement, properly planned with plenty of little terrace houses, like in many of our villages would provide First Homes while only upsetting a very few people. Not all the Greenbelt is beautiful countryside nor high grade agricultural land.

As a Medway Gap resident I am concerned by the gradual erosion of green spaces in this area. I fear that the responses from residents in Areas 1 and 2 will show a NIMBY attitude and seek to have most new development in Area 3. The need to the two HMAs to each shoulder some of the burden will go some way to alleviate this, but I feel that the green belt should not be treated as a sacred cow. It's not all a green and pleasant land that might have been painted by Constable. There are many small villages slowly dying and becoming economically unviable, and unless a reasonable number of working age residents settle there, what services that remain, such as schools, doctors, buses, pubs and shops will disappear. A village with a predominantly elderly population is not somewhere that we want in the Borough, and would become an unpleasant place to live for the residents unable to move out.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

---

**User Response: Text**

(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.

I am opposed to any development on Green Belt land *adjacent to the town boundaries* because it will ruin the character of the edges of the town, add stress to already over-stressed local services and add to the existing traffic problems and pollution in Tonbridge.

[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 Mitsubishi. It should also be extended southwards across the A20 down to the railway to include site 59604/59606.](#)

I think the greenbelt was a carefully designed planning constraint to contain urban sprawl. It is not a constraint which was meant to be breached to support the problem of the moment.

There are so few green areas being preserved nowadays. People who live alongside them have chosen to live there because of the greenery, lower levels of traffic and (personally speaking) uninterrupted dog walking areas of peace and quiet. Why should every village in nice countryside be turned into a housing estate to meet government

---

**User Response: Text**

figures?

Nature needs to be thought of as much as people do.

A new town or village would have enough infrastructure (especially doctors, shops and school) not to impact too much on current services. It is already hard enough to get an ambulance, e.g. 4 hours on one occasion. It takes at least 45 minutes to get through to the doctors' surgery on the phone to book an appointment. An X-ray used to take place on the same day as requested and now it takes several weeks. A new population in its own town or village would have its own amenities and services.

Tonbridge is very densely populated already.

Strategy 1 should not exclude brown field sites, but no area should be over developed. Most of the Borough is Green Belt where there are all sorts of restraints.. Then follows agricultural land which is a major part of the calls for sites list. Building on this , wether grades 1,2 or even 3 should be avoided as we start to face national food insecurities and rising food production. NO to development on Green or Agricultural land unless all the options have been considered.

In addition the boroughs infrastructure is creaking, especially in the back lanes so extreme care is needed when considering development in theses areas before infrastructure is totally up graded, ( Not just roads but consider pressure on schools & medical facilities etc..)

Once greenbelt is built on it is lost forever so every effort should be made to maintain it.

There is too much suburbanisation of the countryside in the area. Once it is gone you have damaged a beautiful area and it will not return. Every bit of derelict land in towns should be developed before you build even on one piece of countryside. This would reduce commuting also.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.



---

### User Response: Text

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

- a) Green Belt is there to prevent towns and villages linking up to make huge urban areas.
- b) to prevent the countryside being swallowed up.
- c) to help in urban regeneration of derelict sites.
- d) historic towns need to be able to keep their settings

- 1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
- 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
- 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
- 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
- 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Green Belts are a long established and widely supported planning device. They have National significance inasmuch as Government policy for them is set out in a specific National Planning Policy Statement (PPS2). The title "Metropolitan Green Belt" further recognises the regional significance in providing accessible open space for London (the metropolis) as well as large settlements bordering the Green Belt (in Kent, these include the Medway Towns, Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells). In effect, they identify an area in which is expected to remain permanently free from built development.

The Council should be fully aware, because of its geographical location, of its own particular role as a guardian of this environmental asset (in all of its facets) on behalf of these large settlements as well as for its own residents. In particular, while the Council is mandated by PPS2 to use the Development Plan process to make min]or adjustments to Green Belt boundaries, this does not (as matters currently stand) extend to unilaterally abandoning Green Belt policy altogether, or promoting its widespread fragmentation. In effect, the Green Belt should be the choice of last resort and should certainly not be seen as a reserve of potential development land, easily raided when selecting sites for building. "Very Special Circumstances" do not apply when alternatives are available.

The simple point is that if maintaining the integrity of the Green Belt is to be maintained (in option 1, but also in the other options) the corollary is that further thrusts must be added:

Firstly, there must be formulation of strategy and policies to promote "intensification" of development *within* the settlements that are not "washed over" by the Green Belt notation, and avoiding "extensification" *beyond* their boundaries. The evidence base for the sustainability of that approach would need to gathered from realistic analysis of rigorous capacity studies of representative parts of the existing settlements concerned. This does not mean searching for sites to maintain traditional suburban development. Rather, it means engaging local

---

**User Response: Text**

communities in seeking out opportunities to create modern, attractive and efficient towns and villages of significantly more urban character than now, for reasons of long term sustainability and affordability. Policies might follow for extending existing homes upwards, downwards or sideways, and converting garages to homes. Site specific proposals might also follow for tightening the urban fabric by redevelopment or by assembling garden plots, or creating accessible urban “pocket parks” in place of larger open spaces that may be re-planned and enhanced for mixed uses. Some (in appropriate circumstances) might be relocated to areas within the Green Belt, perhaps in an exchange process.

Secondly, strategy should address the need to make full and efficient use of the Green Belt (which is unlikely to increase in extent) in order to accommodate the increasing demands placed upon it by growing urban populations for open recreation, agriculture and wildlife protection. This is an important environment counterbalance for the emphasis now placed on the scope of wider Housing Market Areas well beyond local administrative boundaries. Tonbridge and Malling (with Sevenoaks BC and others in a similar geographical relationship to the “larger metropolitan population”) should take this opportunity to lead in developing strategic policies akin to the establishment of the Metropolitan Green Belt Regional Park. Safeguarding the environment and its natural resources for future generations in such ways should be a cornerstone of the sustainability appraisal.

Thirdly, the spatial strategy should have a component dealing with enforcement, because all the effort and cost of creating a Development Plan is wasted if breaches of planning control are left unresolved. The Council should include specific commitments in the “implementation” section of the Plan, alongside those which deal with developer contributions or “planning gain”, to itself invest in planning enforcement and (elsewhere) also to lobby Government to do likewise.

Minimises impact on areas within the Green Belt and AONB

Our infrastructure is at breaking point already doctors, schools and more traffic on small local roads.

no response

The Green belt around Tonbridge fulfils requirements laid down in NPPF

- Check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- Prevent neighbouring towns merging
- Safeguard countryside from encroachment
- Preserve setting and special character of historic towns
- assist urban generation by recycling derelict and urban land

Expansion of Tonbridge beyond green belt will increase congestion and add to deterioration of inhabitants quality of life.

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another,

---

**User Response: Text**

.To assist in safe guarding the countryside from encroachment.

Expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and the quality of life will go down for peopl living here.

There seems to be a strong bias towards focusing on the Medway Gap where there is already heavily congested roads, limited train service within walking distance, many country lanes and virtually no bus service in rural settlements. Option 4 seems to be the least bad.

In order to retain the biodiversity, open spaces for recreation and the attractive character of the communities withingn the Green Belt. Nature has suffered enough to human needs.

do not want to destroy present country appearance and way of life

As a concept 30/40 years ago Kings Hill was a great idea but it has failed. The development evolved from a small sustainable residential + employment development to a complete hash of high density housing with poor infrastructure. It is growing continuously on an ad-hoc basis with no attempt to improve infrastructure and no real plan. TMBC should step back, update their concept of a and consider a second attempt a residential + employment development and get it right this time.

This would seem to give a good balance between urban and rural areas, providing services accessible to all areas. We would prefer, where it is necessary to intrude into the Green Belt we believe this should naturally adjoin an

---

**User Response: Text**

already developed area. We do not believe isolated pockets of development in Green Belt areas is acceptable.

Option 2 is closest to my preference as it will retain as much as possible the rural character of the borough and concentrate new development in sustainable locations close to established centres and services. Recognising the pressure to find sites for new housing, I would add to this Borough Green, West Malling Station and Hildenborough Station as locations for more development. I appreciate this increases development in the Green belt, but close proximity to the rail network outweighs this. If we are to get people off the roads then housing needs to be within walking distance of stations and Hildenborough and West Malling Stations are currently isolated, with no surrounding development.

I would not support option 3, which introduces the next tier, Rural Service Centres, as Hadlow and East Peckham are too isolated and distant from train or trunk road connections to be viable or sustainable centres for development. Bus services are insufficient and polluting and do not provide a viable alternative to car use, resulting in congestion at all major road intersections.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Settlements are set up with infrastructure, services and public transport. Much more sense to enlarge and expand these, 'fill in' brown field sites and improve the services to accommodate more residents.

The rural environment and Areas of Outstanding Beauty of our borough are not set up to meet these needs as well as the absolute necessity to preserve these beautiful areas for farming and outdoor recreation e.g. cycling, riding, walking. The lanes are narrow and can not cope with the increased traffic which would arise. They are already used as rat runs. Seven Mile Lane and the A 228 are very busy roads at present and if there is a problem on one of these roads, traffic jams and huge diversions occur. There is already pressure on schools places and local doctor services - very hard to get appointments.

Avoids urban sprawl around Tonbridge which is already heavily developed beyond its infrastructure resources.

Looks like the least amount of widely spread development in this area

My favoured option is **OPTION 1: OUTSIDE** of GREEN BELT and AONB which must be protected at all costs.

---

**User Response: Text**

Whilst all areas need some development, GREEN BELT was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is sacrosanct.

To preserve existing areas of outstanding natural beauty and conservation areas within the borough.

TO protect the greenbelt and AONB

I don't agree with any of these distributions because none of them offer to not over develop Kings Hill. All of these strategies class Kings Hill wrongly as an Urban area (which it is not and neither do residents want it to be) and all strategies involve over developing this village. This is purely money led. Kings Hill is not urban and does not have sufficient infrastructure to support new homes. It's already impossible to get GP apts, people are having to travel to other villages to get seen by Drs because our surgery is so over subscribed, all the primary schools are full, there is no secondary school, there are not enough community spaces and your plan is to build over the ones that are there.

The preference to not release green belt land but develop outside the green belt boundary.

The green belt and AONBs must not be built on when other options are available.

Need to protect Greenbelt and ANOB, Need to focus on existing transport infrastructure so new homes can access trains/buses. Need to focus on job employment sites- so homes near jobs to reduce pollution. Need to focus on affordable housing with clean air so plant trees in these areas as well . Could bring Borough Green and Hildenborough into this as both have rail links and a bus service from them. Need to look at industrial land/ towards the motorways. Flood Zone 3 within these areas should not be built on unless stringent measures are used to safeguard properties.

Development should be an expansion of the existing urban environment and not an invasion of important rural space green belt and AONB.

Development should be representative of ability of a town/community to support such expansion

building should focus on developing brown field sites and away from countryside - we should be protecting the natural environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

All of these options further expand the development of dwellings around West Malling and Kings Hill. North East of the borough has already seen more than its fair share of development over the last 20 years (58% of developments) and the area is becoming completely over-developed, which the infrastructure and services cannot support.

The local plan should be focussed on developing brown-field sites as its number 1 spatial objective and ensure that area of outstanding natural beauty and site of historic and environmental value maintained. It should also focus on reducing climate emissions (so should not support people moving out of London into North Kent to commute back into London for work)

Kings Hill was intended to be a development such that residents could work locally and have recreational facilities and be sustainable. Now, very few residents of Kings Hill work locally (as there are not the businesses to support those who live there) and there are vast numbers of residents who commute into London, Tonbridge, Tunbridge Wells and further afield.

Current built up areas are already over developed

To protect green belt and Aonb

The start

No response

I would like to see preservation of the open spaces as much as possible.

All of the above options have considerable disadvantages in my opinion, and I am therefore reluctant to select any of them. My main objection is the encroachment upon Green Belt land, and in my own particular location the lack of infrastructure to support significant development together with the already overcrowded and increasingly dangerous roads.

Of the options presented we prefer Option 4 whereby some housing - in proportion to the size of the settlement - is allocated to each settlement. There are young people in every settlement that need local housing. This is also more deliverable as often very large allocations prove problematic and prone to delay.

CPRE Kent would like to see sixth option being tested - one that does not meet the full housing requirement to reflect the fact that:

- the standard methodology calculation is flawed – it creates a scenario that addresses housing demand, rather than need

---

**User Response: Text**

- 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
- 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

It is important to keep green belt land. Use brown fill sites. There are plenty of empty buildings in towns, such as Maidstone that could be turned into affordable housing and for groups, such as the homeless

To allow green fields to be untouched.

I prefer option 1 as it looks to develop existing urban areas further rather than developing rural areas; protecting the Greenbelt and AONB areas. My only amendment to option 1 would be to include development focus in Tonbridge itself so that there is support for the West Kent housing marker area as well as the Maidstone and Medway housing market areas.

To protect the greenbelt and AONB

The local infrastructure is already at breaking point. Our local doctors surgery has 22,000 patients and just 3 full time doctors. Nowhere in the plans listed for near my area is there anything suggesting new doctor surgeries, schools or local infrastructure improvements. To cross into green belt land to add to this already heavy burden is not the answer. Building near current larger urban areas where the buses, trains and jobs are makes more sense than building across wildlife corridors and AONB.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

---

**User Response: Text**

I understand the need to develop new houses; I prefer the option of expanding the existing main centres of the population. These are the areas best served by transport infrastructure. I agree with the priority of developing brownfield sites before green belt (or other undeveloped land) where possible, but recognise that these options are limited. That said, I do feel the need to think of how we can redevelop high streets in the main urban and rural service centres as shopping habits change. I would like to see development to include replacing redundant shops with residential premises and community service-orientated businesses such as cafés and local shops similar to Sevenoaks town centre with a good range of independent shops and businesses and redevelopment of the former Tesco store.

Again I question the level of housing

Protects green belt and develops urban areas with better infrastructure.

(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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct and once lost it is gone forever; it is not a reuseable commodity.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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.



---

**User Response: Text**

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

This would do least damage to the environment. People living in Urban areas would have green spaces that they can access .It would protect biodiversity. It would reduce the need to build additional infrastructure.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
- (b) to merging prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- (c) to assist in safe guarding the countryside from encroachment;
- (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns:
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

We need greenbelt land for the sustainability of our environment.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Green spaces and green belt land, rural communities cannot sustain any further over development. There are more than enough brownfield sites to meet TMBC housing allocation but developers would rather develop greenfield land as it's cheaper. This not an acceptable strategy for TMBC to adopt.

Makes use of existing infrastructure in existing significant settlements, without destroying the small villages/ green belt/AONB areas that make this council area so special.

---

**User Response: Text**

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

I do not support options 1-4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is a mixture of green belt, useful high grade agricultural land and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Option 4 would be the preferred option as it would spread the development most evenly and is most likely to result in development being focussed on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted in the last 20 years the area around West Malling including Kings Hill has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing. The report compiled for the Broadwater Action group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden never mind any additional development.

Option 2 impacts a minimal amount of greenbelt land and countryside areas. However, I would raise concerns with the fact that the plan "seeks to locate development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities". Considering many of the existing facilities and services, such as road access, schools and healthcare are already overburdened, I believe that merely adding population to services that are struggling as is, without any plans or provisions for either new services, or expanding the resources of existing healthcare services will result in a significant decline in quality and accessibility of public services to all areas affected. For any plan to be successful, it is imperative that public services in this area must be expanded before any significant development can take place.

need for housing but protect greenfield

- protects greenbelt and areas of beauty
- area in option 1 has solid transport links
- option 1 settlements are emerging communities with scope to develop for future, e.g. newer housing, the blend would be less impactful between new and old

---

**User Response: Text**

- protects over development in places such as Tonbridge which has potential to lose its charm and links to immediate countryside and rivers

retain a healthy living environment especially with the move to more working from home. Urban spread will destroy the environment as well as result in overcrowding. This will in turn overstretch the infrastructure and result in physical and mental health crises.

None of these strategies.

Please leave our community alone. More and more cars on the estate roads, more traffic lights and congestion.

More people, not enough Doctors or medical centres. Please do not add to this.

The delivery of the Tudeley and Paddock wood projects will already diminish available green belt and farm land and cause further congestion and strain on services in Tonbridge. Any further loss of Green Belt and farm land is only going to exacerbate this problem.

I do not accept any of these choices. It appears that, by offering a choice of 6 options, the intent is to obtain a conclusion that '*residents of Tonbridge & Malling prefer option X and therefore this option is supported by the residents*' so that development can commence 'with the support of the population'. However, I and most residents would prefer NONE of these options. We **DO NOT** want more housing being built on our beautiful surrounding countryside, destroying habitat, adding pressure on infrastructure, roads, services and worsening the character of the area.

I understand that the central government has imposed targets of increasing the housing on TMBC, and that TMBC is following this directive from government. I wish to register my strong disagreement with the government's requirements to increase housing in this area and urge that the policy should be re-designed. I think government should not see to continually grow the South East at the expense of the Region, but instead invest in the Regions to stop the transmigration of people to the overcrowded South East and to areas such as Tonbridge & Malling.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

---

**User Response: Text**

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

It protects greenbelt and ANOB. Tonbridge is already under extreme pressure from development around Paddock Wood, East Peckham and the proposed Tudeley development in the Tunbridge Wells plan.

From what I can decipher from the option maps this I feel spreads the burden of development more fairly across the borough and hopefully will encourage more development on brownfield sites within existing settlements to not only improve the settlements themselves but also ensure better land usage within current settlements, and reduce building on farm land to an absolute minimum. If there is additional need a separate 'new settlement' can be then be considered. This 'demand' needs however to be extensively challenged with the government as the data has changed dramatically in recent years due to Brexit, & Covid amongst other things.

Option 4 distributes development around the borough, placing the least amount of stress on local services. Thinned out development over a wider area can be absorbed more easily.

Due to high demand for local amenities such as doctors, dentists and schools, development should be spread thinly so everyone shares benefits and deficits.

We have found the descriptions and maps difficult to understand but believe Option 1, if we understand correctly, is best as it will protect greenbelt and A.O.N.B areas and local communities from being spoilt.

I feel that further developing previously developed land within urban areas and service centres is most sensible as there will be less need for travelling across the region and the environmental impact on the borough will be less

no comment

Development should also continue previously developed land within urban centres, rural service centres and other rural settlements.

To avoid over-development in the Borough, bearing in mind that most of it is Green Belt with major constraints. And to avoid additional pressure on infrastructure - particularly the increased pressure on roads that are already congested, but also pressure on schools and medical facilities.

The countryside is eroding. It needs to be protected for sustainability and future generations. Also around the

---

**User Response: Text**

areas suggested, particularly mereworth, you are purposing works on single tract roads which feed into already congested major roads ie A228( which is already not fit for purpose) and seven mile line. There is not the infrastucture to support building without ruining existing hedgrows and environment. The junction between kent street and A228 has already been responsible for major injuries.

To protect the valuable rural character of Tonbridge & Malling Borough I support Option 1 (focussing development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or Option 2 (focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas as well as land adjacent to these settlements). I do not support Option 3 (focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and rural service centres), Option 4 (focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements) or Option 5 (focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, thereby seeking to maximise the use of previously-developed land in the borough, as well as a new settlement/s remote from existing towns and villages) all of which would have a major impact on Offham including its rural character, and landscape the health and wellbeing of its local residents.

By pursuing Option 1 or Option 2, the Sustainability Appraisal objectives by which sites are assessed can best be achieved through access to education and community facilities, proximity to public transport, through support of health and wellbeing and by protecting important health, environment, landscape and natural assets, valuing the distinct rural character of the area enjoyed by those living in both the Borough's towns and its villages.

In makes sense to expand areas that have already got some level of infrastructure or is currently being developed to expand on this. This would include roads, public transport and services such as shops, GPs etc. Option 1 focuses the development on a small area not using the current infrastructure available further south. Options 3, 4 and 5 focus on areas closer to small villages rather than towns so there would be a need to expand the road system, much of the county already has a well developed road system with motorways and dual carriageways and to build more of these in the country side would have a huge impact on what makes Kent so beautiful. Building more roads and building to house the services the residents would require would unnecessarily impact the environment both during the building process and subsequently by the noise and pollution caused by traffic. Residents in the county should have a choice whether to live in an urban development of rural settlement and this choice would also be removed in villages were expanded. Building on green belt in a choice I wholeheartedly disagree with, our countryside needs to be developed to support nature not removed to build houses.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:-

- 1 prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- 2 prevent neighbouring towns merging
- 3 safeguard the country side from encroachment
- 4 preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- 5 assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

---

### User Response: Text

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing greenbelt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The green belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this local plan.

This strategy option makes sense to me due to the infrastructure already in place to accommodate increased housing. Suitable roads and rail networks as well as shops, businesses and schools, beyond these areas there is little that would support additional housing with respect to adequate infrastructure which would be required and add to the cost and complexity of additional housing in the borough.

This option focuses on already developed or developing areas with good infrastructure, schools etc.

I am not sure what you mean by settlement confines in option 1 and why these do not appear in option 2? I have selected option one because I would like to see the majority of development in urban areas, maximising use of brown field sites and minimising the use of green belt and areas of outstanding beauty for development. Unhelpfully green belt etc is not shown in option 2 figure 4 so it is hard to judge the degree of use of green belt in this plan. I am particularly against any large housing development in Borough Green and against a Garden City with 3000 housing almost doubling the size of housing in this area. The local infrastructure will not support a large development at Borough Green and having looked at the developers plans for Borough Green felt they gave little regard to green energy saving building . Sevenoaks Plan is not out for consultation yet so it is not possible to see the plans for development on borough boundaries for all neighbouring boroughs. This should be taken into account to look at the impact on areas near borough boundaries. I am against large housing development in rural areas. Any development should be proportional to the size of existing local rural communities.

The use of the term quantum option is jargonistic and not assessable. What do you mean? If you mean by assessed need that the new housing in the plan should be for those in most housing need who cannot afford to buy on the open market then yes and if they will be affordable either to buy or rent then yes.

On the assumption Option 1 is not viable as already over developed, my preference is Option 2 as this will afford new housing in already developed areas and minimise the impact to the unique Kent environment. Any increase in housing under option 2 has to address travel (tonbridge at rush hour has a 20-30 minute queue to get to the train station and as such increasingly polluted) and health services (1 week delay to get access to local GPs).

Any development on Semi rural Option 3 must not be considered as it will forever lose the unique character of Kent: Tonbridge & Malling has many single track roads, ancient woodlands, footpaths and hedgerows ruining what is unique about our county “the garden of England”. Any development under option 3, 4 or 5 must be prevented as it is not sustainable : widening of designated ‘Quiet lanes’, removal of hedgerows, removal of woodland, damaging grade 1 agricultural land losing the beauty of Kent for our future generations. It would also force people to commute by car thus still requiring investment in travel infrastructure for urban areas as per options 1 & 2 anyway.

- With option 1 there is no (and frankly unnecessary) need to build on greenbelt land
- Option 1 has least negative impact on biodiversity of all the options
- Option 1 is least likely to negatively affect the landscape, quality and character of the borough

---

### User Response: Text

- Option 1 would have less negative impact on air quality and emissions than the other options
- Option 1 would likely still provide a good supply of quality housing of varying types/sizes, all without building on greenbelt
- By not developing in the greenbelt outskirts of Tonbridge, there might be less chance of increased traffic at the Waterringbury crossroads caused by people travelling from Tonbridge to Maidstone.

Worst options:

- Option 4 and 5 start to fragment the greenbelt further and risk isolating particular types of animals and reduce wildlife corridors
- Option 4 and 5 have a significant negative impact on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions and therefore climate change
- Option 5 would really carve up the greenbelt with a large area of new settlement

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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;
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C.in their current local plan.

We should limit any development on green belt land at all costs. With an environmental crisis the prioritisation of housing development should exhaust brownfield sites and limit development. Also, we should protect our villages and rural service centres which define English culture. People in these areas don't want to live in a town.

A majority of the people who want development in green belt land areas are property development companies and land owners looking to financially benefit, something that local residents are acutely aware of. Council members are only too willing to allow them to build frequently on green belt land already, prioritising their own interests of local residents.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

1 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

2 to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

---

**User Response: Text**

4 to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and

5 to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Further expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing green belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's population.

The urban areas are already quite full, it is enough to take a look at Tonbridge high street, the supermarkets are full, the train station, traffic is very dense. There is no room to accommodate development in the urban areas without investment in adapting the infrastructure to accommodate more people. Therefore it is more appropriate to place new dwellings in less densely populated areas of the borough.

To avoid building on greenbelt land wherever possible, and to not add more pressure on infrastructure, which is already overwhelmed.

People chose to live in small rural places precisely because they are small and rural. Expanding those places would directly hurt people who live there. Building within Green Belt must be strictly ruled out.

Rural landscape, e.g. Shipbourne, provides a huge irreplaceable resource for public relaxation, exercise, mental well-being, for borough residents. Shipbourne Common within it's wider landscape of hills, fields and woodlands supports considerable local biodiversity. Significant development (Sites 59825, 59779, 59827) would considerably degrade this amenity; degrade views to/from the Conservation Area, significantly increase daily traffic flows (Safe Lanes initiative); require significant infra-structure investment (in drainage, power) and lead to urbanisation. Greenbelt Study 2016 2:1:2 states high figures of Greenbelt erosion. Para's 2:1:15 to 2:1:17 cite Government support in protecting Greenbelt. Essential services (e.g medical, bus services, transport options) to support housing are located within the Urban sites and offer more economic solutions than rural sites. Developers "large site" housing architecture seldom compliments rural villages and their landscape contrary to proviso in SA6 for these sites.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

This seems to avoid using so much countryside and would mean that everywhere in the area would use the urban parts to their full potential.



---

**User Response: Text**

I believe it is important to avoid the spread of existing settlements into adjacent rural areas. If option 1 is unable to provide sufficient development opportunities then Option 5 should be considered.

I have not selected any

It looks to be the least worse option, but is not a favoured option. Why not have development up to the limit which brownfield only sites can take ? You seem to be pandering to the housebuilders. Push back to the Govt who keep blathering on about levelling up.

Option 4 I think that all communities need housing for young families from the locality and see no reason why rural villages should be exempt. There should be a range of housing, including 1 and 2 bed flats and affordable starter homes. Not 5-bed executive housing. The amount of development should be proportionate to the size of the settlement. Option 5 appears to be Borough Green Garden City, which is an option that urbanises the area forming continuous development between Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green and North Ightham.

TMBC is in the South East of England developments around existing urban centres only will only solve the housing shortfalls in the short term.

it is important to maintain the greenbelt and areas of outstanding beauty . Services are available in urban areas that are not in other areas

This option provides links to already existing services, particularly transport links. Concentrating development in fewer sites will enable demand for additional services such as healthcare and educational needs to be included in development plans.

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.

It was our intention to move from city to rural area. It cost us a lot of money, time and efforts. We chose house near to the Green Belt area to secure the status of the area around.

To protect the greenbelt and AONB

---

**User Response: Text**

TO protect the greenbelt and AONB

The original purpose of the Greenbelt is to protect green open space around urban areas and to keep urban sprawl in check. Now it also serves to protect against air pollution, climate change, providing habitats for wildlife, protecting woodland, supporting health and wellbeing. This protection should be just that: 'protection' and should not be so easily passed over.

I do not want to see developments built within the Green Belt boundary or inside the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty because I moved to Larkfield to enjoy this beautiful county full of greenfields and I don't want to be confronted with a concrete jungle of houses everywhere I look.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

To protect the environment and preserve the AONBs and Green Belt

With the first 4 options you are simply creating urban sprawl connecting previously unconnected conurbations. There is no definable centre. The Medway Gap is an ugly unplanned development with no centres, simply a main road full of traffic. Extensive new housing needs to have a proper urban plan.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field

---

**User Response: Text**

land, which I would not support.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 1 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- 2 To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- 3 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- 4 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and
- 5 To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants.

To Protect the Greenbelt and AONB

For people's mental health, the existing green belt should be preserved as much as possible. This provides ecological and species diversity benefits too.

The original purpose of the Greenbelt is to protect green open space around urban areas and to keep urban sprawl in check. Now it also serves to protect against air pollution, climate change , providing habitats for wildlife, protecting woodland, supporting health and wellbeing. This protection should be just that: 'protection' and should not be so easily passed over.

---

**User Response: Text**

Once lost Green Belt and Area Of Natural Beauty cannot be recovered.

The reasons for Green Belt should not be ignored.

In the past decade more and more areas of natural beauty are being eroded and replaced with housing estates. before long there will be a minimal amount of countryside for future generations to enjoy.

Everyone needs to share the pain.

The areas of outstanding natural beauty, green belt and good quality agricultural land must be preserved at all cost.

Access to transport infrastructure, including roads and rail is key. The original Borough Green Garden City scheme was unworkable as it did not commit to creating the transport infrastructure before the new housing.

Community infrastructure such as schools and shops/medical is also critical.

The "other rural settlements" cannot support a weight of new housing without improvement to transport and community infrastructure.

By focussing development on urban and on rural service centres, access to facilities for the dwellings developed will be better, and the sense of identity of the smaller rural communities will be preserved.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) expects planning policies and decisions to promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes, **therefore to maintain quality of life, physical & mental health of borough residents in Tonbridge & Malling, across Kent & save areas currently in decline such as Tonbridge** - urban areas need to be the focus to get people to help with regeneration rather than adding to transport quadmire & causing gridlock.

**Best use of finite brown field land for denser dwellings** should be promoted by the Council as oppose to wide spread executive housing (that benefits developers profits?)

Not in best interest of current ares and support facilities

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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;

---

**User Response: Text**

(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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl and is it characterised by openness and permanence.

Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are designated for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the landscape.

To protect the green belt and AONBs

This does not ingress on to greenbelt land. Once lost always gone. We will never be able to reclaim lost green belt.

All areas around Tonbridge within the greenbelt comply with the requirements set out in the NPPF

- To prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
- To prevent neighbouring towns becoming as one.
- To safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan. Further expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in the already terrible congestion worsening along with a decline in air quality.

T&MBC in the Wateringbury area is very much focussed on the rural roots of the community. There has been much development locally in the Kings Hill area which has changed the dynamic for the residents there but I feel that areas such as Wateringbury have thus far managed to retain their integrity. It is essential that the rural nature of the area is kept especially regarding the community access to the countryside that has become so important particularly following the Covid pandemic. We need to be able to support the existing community giving them access to goods and services and a rural lifestyle that they need. We have precious little Green belt and rural areas left and it is essential to ensure that these are kept for future generations. Once built on, they will be lost forever.

---

**User Response: Text**

The character of the area is utterly important. Current plans will make this a town and link the villages making this just another urban sprawl. This is rural kent = orchards UK garden, how can this be seen as a way of protecting or advancing the environment. It cannot and will give an opposite outcome. Yes the Council must address the Govt strategy but at what cost.

To save our borough from more destruction

I would be a fair option for all. We moved to Kings Hill 18 years ago as it was considered to be a village and I would like to keep it that way.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF: 1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging. 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF: 1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging. 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan. The proposed development sites on the Tonbridge/Hildenborough border on Green Belt land ref 59821,59823 is not infill within the village and will effectively remove any demarcation between the town and the village. Hildenborough will become part of the town forever and will completely lose its identity.

We need to think about encouraging investment in the existing urban areas that are well ready well connected to commuter links. Some of these areas appear to be in decline and it is more likely that affordable more intensive housing (including hi rise) could be accommodated in these spaces allow easy access to the capital, and providing a source of growth for the business centres in and around those areas. Spreading the housing throughout the region would intensify the impact on transport links in what is already highly congested. Our village of Wateringbury crossroads suffers from both high levels of congestion at the crossroads with miles long tailbacks at rush hour and the consequence pollution impact making it the most polluted postcode in the borough. Also preserved will be the character of the countryside allowing for spaces that the urban dwellers can easily access and enjoy nearby. This will also continue to support our agricultural industry, notable with soft fruit.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

---

**User Response: Text**

That places like Borough Green with the amount of houses should be moved to an urban area that is able to developed further. This part keeps arguing that it is other rural settlements which should not be the case.

Wrotham could be argued as a Rural service area working alongside Borough Green.

It would not be hard to see areas such as Medway Gap in crouching Eccles and surrounding villages

The creation of a new settlement such as Borough Green Gardens, could deliver new infrastructure to support the new development and address existing issues such as poor air quality. The remaining development would be dispersed over the district therefore the impact on existing areas and green spaces would be less significant. Borough Green is an ideal location for a new garden village, it was included in the withdrawn plan and could deliver a relief road, allowing for the existing A25 through the village centre to be downgraded to improve air quality and accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians.

The creation of anew settlement would deliver a high quantity of the housing need over the plan period and perhaps beyond. This would reduce the need to develop on existing green spaces and therefore preserve air quality, the environment and quality of life on existing residential areas.

More dispersed development over the whole district would mean the density of development in existing areas would be lower and more acceptable. A new settlement away from the already heavily developed areas would alleviate the pressures on these areas, especially where infrastructure, facilities and access is already insufficient in some places.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

---

**User Response: Text**

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Mainly selecting option 3 because the infrastructure is in place or can be easily expanded.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF

1. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
3. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing green belt Boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments ( Tudeley & Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council in their current local plan.

Option 1 more closely matches the aspiration to retain the settlement hierarchy which is commensurate with the character of the area placing less of a burden on the development of facilities and infrastructure. Options 3,4 and 5 would have a significant impact upon the roads and other infrastructure with more journeys being made between distributed locations.

Option 2 - preserves existing green corridors which are essential in ensuring the character and spatial qualities of East and West Malling are not lost and existing infrastructure is not swamped by future development (extant permissions have achieved this in the absence of a Local Plan ) a new Local Plan - CANNOT - make this situation worse.

The Green Belt and ANOB should be retained.

Development should be applied based upon community needs rather than purely where land is available.

Building should only take place within existing urban areas not on top of greenfield or areas of outstanding beauty/ agricultural land

The use of green belt and AONB sites should only be approved as an absolute last resort if insufficient sites are available through strategies 2-5. These sites should have ruled out via the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)



---

**User Response: Text**

assessment of sites.

These areas have existing infrastructure and are outside ANOB and Greenbelt. We need to protect Greenbelt and ANOB areas for our children's future, and to protect nature, reduce climate change and therefore we should not be concreting them over.

The green belt land and AONB/ AONB settings should be protected and building in existing urban developments and on previously developed land seem the obvious answer.

Greenbelt and areas of outstanding natural beauty need to be preserved

Developments should not spread beyond well defined limits to prevent urban sprawl.

Where there is a greater concentration of the population better public transport can be provided and there can be more choice in facilities and activities.

The infrastructure in and around Ightham and Borough Green is already at breaking point with air pollutions at junctions already exceeding limits. This information should already be in your hands -AND CONNOT BE IGNORED. Take into account the coroners report into a childs death from a recent air pollution case

The roads in the area are already over congested and there is no infrastructure to support the amount of proposed housing! It is VITAL that the greenbelt and AONB areas are protected for future generations. Pollution and noise levels are already unacceptably high.

I am very concerned about the erosion of the very nature of the rural service centres if they are included in the scale of development proposed in the latter options. They will cease to be rural service centres over the plan period and will become URBAN thus destroying thier very nature. Far better to continue to grown existing urban areas.

I am also concerned that the transport infrastructure does not exist around these rural centres to handle the inevitable traffic volumes without significant and potentially undeliverable road improvements . This risks turning lasagne parts of TMBC into traffic jams.

I am also concerned about the pull of Sevenoaks for both commuters ( although the new route from Maidstone to London Bridge will help if they are frequent enough) and shoppers especially in the west of the region. Traffic flows north /south have capacity on the A21 but not the A227 - east west is poorly served along the A25 west of Borough Green with existing bottle necks at Seal already. The need to work collaboratively with Sevenoaks on the development plans for the west of the borough will be imperative to avoid completely transforming the

---

**User Response: Text**

AONB area into a massive car jam!

The landscape of the borough is of beautiful countryside with excellent agricultural land, also woods and AONB. These should be preserved as that is what makes TMBC special. The Plan does not acknowledge that TMBC is easily accessible to London and therefore the Plan should recognise that the capital city will always provide a good proportion of the economic opportunities for residents in TMBC, and this will always influence travel within and from the Borough as well as mean the Borough does not need to be self-sufficient for jobs. Therefore a key part of the Local Plan should be to preserve what makes TMBC special and not a suburb of London and the Green Belt is critical to achieving this.

The best use of non greenbelt land with the least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating more flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent and therefore will naturally create more affordable housing elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in options 1 & 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby,

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in Particular the proposed development at CAPEL ,on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am also concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies ( Environment , Highways, NHS and Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning Consultation process. I am also concerned about Developer engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

Wider area than option 1 has potential to destroy core character and environment of the area.

There is insufficient infrastructure/amenities for current levels of population and homes, let alone more. Building further from urban areas increases transport use.

---

### User Response: Text

Minimal impact on infrastructure. I object vehemently to developments that create impact on the green belt, and existing open spaces; there is very poor access to medical and dental facilities available to the villages that make up Tonbridge and Malling. Our road system cannot cope now, let alone with the increase in housing envisaged - and what account is taken of the surrounding Boroughs and their plans, which will also impact on the infrastructure that supports us.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

The metro green belt around tonbridge is fulfilling its purpose .

It prevents spread of large built up areas .

Stops neighbouring towns merging and spreading .

Prevents encroachment into the countryside .

preserves historic towns character .

Assists urban regeneration by recycling derelict and urban land .

Further expansion of Tonbridge into the green belt will cause extreme congestion and a loss in the quality of life for its residents , which will be even greater if pending Tunbridge wells council plans in Tudeley and Paddock impact as expected .

Because this option protects greenbelt and the AONBs. These areas are vital assets to Tonbridge and Malling and are the reason that many of us choose to live here. They also serve as green lungs for this over-crowded corner of England. Developments of affordable housing and social housing should be built wherever possible on previously developed or brown field sites in areas with good access to transport links and workplaces. Absolute priority should be given to social and affordable housing.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result

---

**User Response: Text**

in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Protecting the Environmental and Heritage assets of the Borough has the advantage of maintaining and over time enhancing these assets for all those living in the area, either for: visiting, passage through, general wellbeing and pride of place.

Further development of our Urban and Rural Service Areas makes best use of existing infrastructure and allows a more focused improvement schemes to enhance each area to provide more appealing, greener and entertaining centres of attraction. As retailing diminishes and/or changes and as we move towards alfresco cafe dining, town centre craft and work/home lifestyles are urban centres will be transformed.

Safe cycling and walking is more likely to be achieved in existing centres at reasonable costs.

The Green Belt is important to the character of TMBC, there has already been quite a lot of development in Hildenborough, esp the former Fidelity site and new car home which need to be completed and the impact seen both on the environment (impact of flooding), the infrastructure and on life in Hildenborough.

I understand that some development has to happen and that there is a quota to fulfil. I fundamentally disagree with building on green belt! This is an AONB, with 70%+ being greenbelt. I think developments should be focused on areas such as Kings Hill and Snodland which already have new builds and the infrastructure to cope with additional housing. We must preserve, protect and respect our greenbelt. There are plenty of brownfield sites and you should look to these spaces to build on first before destroying our green belt areas. What will we look like in 2040? These are small villages and communities and your other proposals seek to wipe this way of life out.

it is imperative that we save the green belt and AONB's .Once they are gone, they are gone forever.

We must prevent villages which are an essential part of the British landscape from coalescing and becoming large urban areas.

It is vital to maintain our open countryside to the benefit of the flora and fauna and the environment

Option one is preferred. If you build on sites near the edge of AONB then you begin to get a sprawl of housing and increased traffic which due to congested roads in the local area seeks out country lanes for cut throughs/ shortcuts and also results in joyriders (both cars & motorbikes) that don't care about the safety of others. This all inevitably means that what were once idyllic, peaceful rural countryside experiences and beautiful quite lanes for residents to enjoy, instead become what High House Lane, Ashes Lane, Blackman's Lane, Oxenhoath and Roughway Roads have all become in recent years...noisy, dangerous and damaged roads, taking away from the very relaxing and enjoyable experience they are meant to be. Instead further development and expanding sites only result in negatively effecting the health and well being of the local wildlife populations.

---

**User Response: Text**

A new settlement is the most likely to minimise erosion of the green belt, disruption to the community and can be planned with the required infrastructure to support the population growth.

I choose this option because there's desire to live in villages across our borough as well as towns. The village shops will benefit from increased custom. There are facilities like schools and doctors which could be enlarged to cope with increased populations. Or in East Peckham a new doctor surgery could be built. It means large new settlements are close to existing roads and new improved cycle paths could be built. Kings Hill could have a new secondary school.

Important to maintain biodiversity and not to encroach on Green Belt and AOONB

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan. There is no discernible benefit to expanding Tonbridge into Green Belt areas, when there are enough brownfield sites and existing empty units of housing to accommodate our needs.

The areas highlighted in Option 1 are closest to main existing infrastructure services E.g. Motorways, mainline trains, hospitals, schools and larger settlements such as Maidstone & Medway to support employment needs of the residents without impacting the rural nature of the borough.

However, consideration must be given to distance from the amenities upon which we all depend and the narrowness of the roads serving smaller communities, especially with regard to essential services accessing new development. Also the type of development required by that community. Wildlife habitat, water resources and prime agricultural land should always be safeguarded.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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

---

**User Response: Text**

(e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham and Hale Street. Roads are already congested.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring

---

**User Response: Text**

areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

Seems the most balanced, holistic view whilst still protecting the countryside.

Seems to be most holistic - still want to protect countryside

It retains the green belt and AONB areas which are highly regarded as places of beauty and relaxation. The other strategies permit increasing levels of invasive development with each step. While it will make adding more houses difficult, it will ensure that land where development is permitted will be used at a higher density, by reducing the amount of land available to developers. However, this does not mean that there should be no new building or infrastructure improvements in the other areas - they need to be made fit for purpose by careful intervention, but without large developments.

This one seems more distributed. I don't want to see development focus one few areas as that would cause traffic problems.

Probably Option 5 however unable to comment fully as need greater understanding on the options, benefits and negatives - would appreciate more information to be able to develop a more informed view - I hope this is an iterative local plan process ie several consultation steps and more opportunity to ask questions.

The urban areas are better suited to envelop developments into their existing infrastructure in a less costly way. The infrastructure in the rural areas is not capable currently to cope with an increase in housing development, and would therefore require much more investment and upgrade in order for the area to be a thriving, safe and enjoyable place to live. The infrastructure in many of the less urban areas are already stretched beyond what is acceptable in my view. Furthermore, it is vitally important to protect the greenbelt land and AONB because it offers enclaves for people and animals to enjoy unspoilt nature and that is positive for both physical and mental health.

Although broadly agreement with option 1 Kings Hill can no be realistically developed further due to the lack of available services and the potential loss of identity of surrounding villages and communities.

---

**User Response: Text**

I consider strategy options are misleading and restrictive as it preempts other options see response to Q 2

Our village quality of life has already deteriorated significantly over the last 10-15 years due to extensive house building projects. This increase in population and vehicles overwhelms services, utilities, parking and gridlock traffic at peak times. Further expansion can only be contemplated after major utility and service upgrades. Therefore Greenbelt and AONB land must be protected at all costs, no exceptions.

The maps for options 2 and 3 do not include Eccles and focus on the existing larger urban areas or villages rather than broadly around the borough. Focusing development solely in these locations would mean that smaller sites such as Land east of Bull Lane, Eccles (SA ref 59831) would not be considered for allocation, despite the benefits it could provide to the local community. Chapel Down considers that it is important for housing to be delivered in a variety of locations, including Eccles; where it can truly help to ensure that communities can grow, and that younger generations have the option of living in villages and rural area where they grew up. Option 4 – delivering development across the borough would achieve this as would option 1 which appears to include Eccles – being a settlement outside of the Green Belt. Chapel Down consider that this is the only strategic option that enables the whole borough to grow in a balanced and sustainable way that benefits everyone.

Greenbelt land is sacrosanct! Once it is gone it is gone forever!

Because respecting the green belt and AONB are absolutely key if our community is going to make any meaningful response to climate change

for the amount of housing required making urban areas bigger I disagree with this makes it easier for the planners to say infrasture is there, its not its over capacited. making new sites makes it easier to properly plan and makes schools and healthcare be added for extra capacity

Housing demand is not solely focused on the main urban areas (Tonbridge, Medway Gap, Snodland, Kings Hill and Walderslade), as such, to solely provide new housing within or adjacent to the existing major urban areas would fail to provide for housing needs in the rural areas of the Borough. By providing a range of sites across the urban areas and larger rural service centres housing would remain to be located in the most sustainable locations with good access to shops, services and public transport, whilst balancing the need for housing in the rural communities.

To provide housing in the smaller settlements / other rural settlements where there are limited/no shops, services or public transport would increase reliance on the private car and would therefore undermine the principles of sustainability outlined in the NPPF.

The green belt boundary is set for good reason. Once you start to breach that, it's a one way ticket to urban sprawl and lost character.



---

**User Response: Text**

It spreads development around the Borough whilst retaining crucial greenbelt land which should be protected at all costs.

Option 3 presents the best balance of development, taking into account the two housing areas of Maidstone and west Kent. It focuses development on existing urban and large rural communities, whilst minimising development in the green belt and area of outstanding natural beauty. Wherever possible development on new greenfield sites should be limited but it is hard to see such development being avoided entirely.

Greenbelt and AONB areas have been identified for particular purposes and these areas should remain untouched

We should build on existing settlements and their infrastructure. Building over prime green belt land remote from existing settlements would be a serious and irreversible act of destruction. The infrastructure and services in these locations do not exist to support extensive development.

The Green Belt must be protected at all costs.

Being born in East Peckham in 1941 i am of an age when i am saddened to see the amount of countryside being used for other than it has always been there for farming and natural country pursuits that are rapidly disappearing

Villages such as West and East Malling should be kept separate and their boundaries maintained if they are to preserve their unique identities . Many of these sites impact on historical sites with Grade 1 and 2 Listed Buildings. Developing these will ruin the integrity of those areas.

Small 'Country Lanes and 'Quiet Roads' will be jammed with traffic which already uses these roads in an effort to avoid highly congested major roads such as the A20/M20. A very significant amount of traffic has already been generated by the huge and ever increasing level of development at King's Hill and this has spilled out onto surrounding road systems such as Offham Road, Teston Road, West Street and West Malling High Street. This will be exacerbated by developments already proposed or in progress in both West and East Malling, e.g. Broadwater Farm and Forty Acre Field.

Green Belt and Green Field sites should not be considered for development. These areas are prime farming land and a haven for nature. In the UK we already have a depleted diversity of wildlife and destroying these vital habitats and areas for quiet recreation would be an irreversible tragedy. Farming is crucial unless we are to be more reliant than ever on imported food. With the cost of imports rising and as people struggle to feed their families, it is more important than ever that we retain self sufficiency. It makes no sense to concrete over prime agricultural land when there are still many Brown Field Sites available. After a new reservoir was deemed unnecessary in Kent some years ago, water will be another potential problem in the future. The water table will be compromised if large tracts of land are covered in concrete.

---

**User Response: Text**

Apart from the highly inadequate highway infrastructure, services in our areas are already stretched to breaking point. The GP to patient ratio in Kent is significantly worse than in other areas of the UK. The promise of a GP surgery at Leybourne Chase has never been honoured and the site has stood empty for many years. It has now been granted a change of use. Schools, bus and train services and hospital facilities are likewise over-subscribed and struggling to cope. The KCC has recently decided to withdraw funding for a number of rural bus services, thereby depriving rural communities of public transport, e.g. in the West Malling area, the No.58, which currently provides a link to Maidstone Hospital. This policy will increase the reliance on private cars/taxis and further increase traffic. It is now unlikely that new development outside of existing settlements would be served by public transport.

- Focus building on areas with strong infrastructure (train station, bus services, amenities, sports clubs etc.).
- Plenty of brownfield sites in urban areas - once Greenfield is used up, it can never come back. History will not be kind on using Greenfield.
- Least risk of flooding issues.
- I am concerned that the Tunbridge Wells housing strategy is to build on the edge of the TMBC Borough putting pressure on TMBC rural areas enough (Paddock Wood, Capel, Matfield etc.)

I don't want to see green belt land used at all. England's green and pleasant land is at risk of extinction! Though as I have said previously, I think Kings Hill has had too much development. Snodland / Medway/ Walderslade are already uglier areas so should be built on before Kings Hill.

The green belt must be protected to maintain the feel of the borough. Plenty of known brownfield sites exist which should be exhausted before any consideration is given to surrounding greenfield sites (option 2)

In particular options 4 and 5 would be detrimental to the natural environment, biodiversity and the mental well-being of everyone currently living in and enjoying the open spaces in the borough.

I have chosen this option as building within the Green Belt boundary and inside the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty would not protect these green spaces. The current growth of housing developments is exponential and if nothing is done to protect these spaces communities surrounding these areas will have no escape from the concrete world we now live in.

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for

---

**User Response: Text**

much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby. I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham. I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

The area of East Malling north of Kings Hill was in the last local plan (rejected overall but not because of this green belt extension) to be assigned as Green Belt, however now it seems that this area is to be developed completely and become nothing more than an urban outspill. As I understand it the area around East/West Malling, ie Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange has ALREADY absorbed the vast and disproportionate majority of housing increase in the borough. Other areas of the borough need to be used as well to counter the completely lopsided map (your appendix A) which is current and also envisaged to get so much worse by this proposed plan.

The Green Belt around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: to check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent towns merging into one another; to help in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; to help urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt will result in severe congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants (particularly in view of developments proposed by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council at Tudely and Paddock Wood).

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The Green Belt should not be reduced around Kings Hill, East Malling, West Malling and Watlingbury. Each settlement should have its own individual character and important green spaces.

Kings Hill was once brownfield land (an airfield surplus to requirements largely). This brownfield development has now nearly reached capacity.

I feel that preserving the rural nature of the majority of the borough should be the primary consideration. I am against green field and green belt development. I consider there are numerous brownfield land opportunities within existing settlements. These may be more difficult to develop, but are a much more appropriate way to meet housing need. I also consider option 2 sensible.

---

**User Response: Text**

As previous comments

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

There is a need for housing in all communities small and large, in particular for young families in their locality. There is a need for starter homes both to rent and to buy. But in all cases, the level of development should be proportional to the size of the community and the services it can provide.

This area is getting too built up without any green areas. Too much traffic overcrowding schools, dentist & doctor's etc.

Its important not to build on greenbelt land, otherwise there would be no local country side left, we chose to live here for this reason

Also need to consider the negative impact upon wildlife, busier roads and more pollution, there is never any new infrastructure with any new building developments

need to avoid developing greenfield sites. Avoid enlarging the urbanisation of the borough - where small communities end up blending into one another

Because it doesn't invade on green space and makes the most of existing developments

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

---

**User Response: Text**

5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

We also support Option 1.

We do not support Option 3 (focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and rural service centres), Option 4 (focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements) or Option 5 (focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, thereby seeking to maximise the use of previously-developed land in the borough, as well as a new settlement/s remote from existing towns and villages) all of which would have a major impact on Offham including its rural character, and landscape the health and wellbeing of its local residents.

By pursuing Option 1 or Option 2, the Sustainability Appraisal objectives by which sites are assessed can best be achieved through access to education and community facilities, proximity to public transport, through support of health and wellbeing and by protecting important health, environment, landscape and natural assets, valuing the distinct rural character of the area enjoyed by those living in both the Borough's towns and its villages.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Kings Hill, a housing development which started in 1989 and continues to this day, and in the Census of 2011 had 7900 residents (a number which has increased every year since) accounts for close to 10% of TMBC total headcount. West Peckham and Mereworth have already had to cope with the additional traffic from this new town. The lanes around the two villages are incapable of accommodating any more traffic.

There are limited transport links or room for significant expansion of infrastructure to support development in rural areas of the borough, without significant adverse impacts on biodiversity, landscape character, air quality,

---

**User Response: Text**

cultural heritage, and openness of the Green Belt – as the sustainability appraisal makes clear.

Development should not be permitted in Rural Areas as this would cause significant harm to the countryside, and on people's health and wellbeing who currently reside in these areas, which are widely used for leisure and recreation. In addition, building on grade 1 agricultural land would harm the rural economy.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c) to assist in protecting the countryside from encroachment;
- d) to preserve the special character of historic towns; and
- e) to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the rejuvenation of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is likely to be even more relevant due to the pending developments in Tudeley and Paddock Wood, proposed by TWBC in their local plan.

The assessed housing need is already accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have historically all run behind the release of planning permissions, which will only grow and continue due to current economic conditions.

We also have huge scope to grow the developments around Kings Hill and less open spaces than our villages, which are protected by Green Belt and AONB. There are all types of wildlife living in and around our villages - including badgers, foxes, bats, endangered birds etc.

We must preserve the biodiversity of the area. Green spaces really matter to health and well-being.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF

- 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

---

**User Response: Text**

d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

e) to assist in urban re generation by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by T Wells BC in their current plan.

New building needs to minimise car use for reasons of global warming, so new homes need to be located near larger population centres with good transport links. The Green Belt was put in place for a good reason, and it should be respected for a whole range of reasons, including respecting the beauty and biodiversity of the countryside. With current global crises, food production should be maximised, and farmland of any sort should not be built on.

Use of non green belt land is best as it causes least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure and presents the least risk of creating or exacerbating flooding problems within the borough.

Using non green belt land involves cheaper areas for land purchasing, helping to create more affordable housing.

Areas within option 1 and 2 have excellent transport links and roads and services.

Because it is essential to protect the Green Belt and AONB. Development within these areas would have a significant adverse effect on the natural beauty and resources within Tonbridge and Malling. It is important to protect, conserve and enhance this for future generations.

The Green Belt and AONB are there for a very good reason. In addition services in the area are focussed in the areas that are available for development. Living in a semi-rural area, the choice is mine to be a little further away from these services as it is not practical to build the infrastructure to service me locally. Options 1 and 2 maintain the character of the area too. The other options look to urbanise what is otherwise a semi-rural area.

This options would strike the right balance between recognising/enhancing exisiting provision and the need to expand provision beyond the current situation

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

Strategy Option 1 - Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Strategy Option 2 - Urban: Development focussed on sites within (green belt as well as previously-development land) as well as adjacent to urban settlements.

---

**User Response: Text**

Strategy Option 3 - Urban and Rural Service Centres: Development focussed on sites within (green belt as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas and rural service centre settlements.

Strategy Option 4 - Distributed: Development focussed on sites within (greenbelt as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements to support a range of communities.

Strategy Option 5 - New Settlement: Development focussed on sites within (green belt as well as PDL) urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, as well as a new settlement/s. 1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging. 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Development should be focused on urban areas that already have high density housing eg Tonbridge, and the infrastructure already in place to support this (or one that can more easily be enlarged). People who live in this areas have already chosen that kind of area to live in. You should not be forcing an massive housing development onto people who have chosen to live in villages. If they had wanted to live in an large urban area, they would have chosen to live there already.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:



---

**User Response: Text**

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan. If all proposed development sites (including those classified as "Mixed") go ahead then there will be urban sprawl spreading from east Tonbridge through to Paddock Wood.

protection of green belt

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

As long as this plan means housing will be spread out over the whole borough, I think this is better than just making urban areas even bigger than they are now

Ideally the Greenbelt should be maintained as is. However given the need for housing in the borough, a sensible distribution across the borough would achieve to maintain the local environment better than concentrating development around what is classed as Rural Service centres.

Options 1 and 5 were considered.

Ideally we should be looking to maintain settlement identity, Green belt and green borders (Wedges) around developed areas, to avoid urban sprawl and maintain Anti-coalescence policies.

---

**User Response: Text**

This is best managed with brownfield sites, new developments, and limited development on the edges of existing areas.

This should be to limit loss of greenspace (Green belt, farmland, other) and biodiversity, limit increases in pollution and maintain the character of towns and villages. Development for developments sake is a horribly destructive policy.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

I believe Strategy Option 2 is the most palatable of the 5 options. I believe that when selecting a strategy, the Borough needs to be mindful and considerate of existing residents, businesses and other stakeholders, yet it will also be the Borough's duty to find and select suitable land for development, creating a trade-off. The preservation of existing green belt and AONB land should be given a high priority, as biodiversity and environmental sustainability will become ever increasing in value, year on year, as such natural resources become progressively diminished.

Option 1 is the most conservative, and seems to place the full burden of new development on the eastern half of the Borough which does not seem fair or appropriate. In being conservative, I believe there is the highest chance in this not successfully meeting future development needs.

Option 2 appears to be a fairer geographical distribution than Option 1. It has the benefit of preserving the rural nature of the existing rural settlements and limits their exposure to conjoinment with larger urban areas, with the exception of Hildenborough and West Malling. The areas designated for new development are already urban in nature, so less adversely impacted by such new development than a rural settlement / area subjected to rapid expansion. It appears a considerable land area will be potentially made available, making the likelihood of success greater than Option 1 (i.e. by including the perimeter of Tonbridge). Infringement on AONB land is not proposed, and on green belt, the impact is limited. This will need to be carefully managed - e.g. around western

---

**User Response: Text**

Snodland, etc.

Option 3 in my view unnecessarily includes the Rural Service Centres as targets for development, adversely changing their character to fully urban, whilst also appearing to unnecessarily infringe upon existing AONB land, which is highly detrimental to sustainability and biodiversity aims of the local plan.

Option 4 is in my view the least favourable strategy as it leads to significant conjoinment of adjacent settlements / areas, which will result in the most damaging changes in the character of the entire Borough, as well as considerable detrimental infringement of development upon AONB land.

Option 5 is the most radical, but has been disregarded in this response, as it is not possible to comment without a better understanding of the siting strategy of the proposed new settlement (other than it has to lie somewhere within the Borough).

the boundaries of the town or tonbridge must not under ANY circumstances be allowed to spread over any green belt land whatsoever. urban land MUST be used

It is imperative that greenbelt and AONB areas are protected from development.

This protects the Green Belt and the AONB and the overall traditional character of the T&M district. Focussing development in the North East of the district provides an opportunity for a major upgrade in housing, infrastructure, etc. in this urban area which is well served with road and rail connections to the rest of the UK and to Europe.

Cannot support any of the Strategy Options but the best of them will be Option 5. Build on OTHER areas.

From all other Questionnaires you are receiving -

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area so should not be included as a focus for development

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer green belt boundary to protect areas of outstanding natural beauty and rural, nature reserves protecting the quiet area from disruptive, dangerous development.

Keep development out of the Green Belt and AONB. Concentrating development in one area will make it easier and more efficient to improve the infrastructure to cope with new houses.

---

**User Response: Text**

Development of Tonbridge beyond green belt will exacerbate our already congested roads and stretched local services,

Focus on the existing most developed areas that sit outside of any green belt or AONB

By focussing development on urban and on rural service centres, access to facilities for the dwellings developed should be and need to be better, and the sense of identity of the smaller rural communities would be preserved. Those communities expected to absorb new development should benefit from improved facilities to cope with the increased numbers.

We do not believe that any of the strategies are necessarily desirable or workable, councillors feeling that this option is the 'least worst' option but accepting that they are broadly the reasonable alternatives from which to develop future and perhaps different preferences. Whatever form of spatial strategy emerges, we support a strong emphasis on separate rural communities.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

**The expansion of Tonbridge beyond Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.**

I have not explicitly selected any of the above options, as there is a fundamental flaw in the classification of Kings Hill as an urban settlement.

If the above objection is corrected, then Option 2 would be the least worse option; if the above objection is not corrected, then Option 4 might be the least worse option, avoiding any one area being over-developed. But the key to any development is to make sure that is designed carefully, with regard to the character of any existing settlements, while ensuring environmental considerations and the holistic well-being of all inhabitants are taken into account. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, let alone any additional development.

---

**User Response: Text**

To avoid over-development in the Hadlow village, which most of it is classified as green belt. Also, the Hadlow village does not have the infrastructure to support the additional housing. The roads are already congested and will only add to the pressure.

To preserve the countryside.

To be able to meet a range of needs in different areas - both rural and urban - as well as make best use of transport infrastructure that already exists and/or can be more easily developed.

To lessen the impact on one particular area?

Focusing on the urban areas will improve the local economy more rapidly than in rural areas; option 1 would be catastrophic for local small villages.

I do not want any changes. I do not want any of the strategies above! I like it as it is. Ightham is a historic village and should remain so. Borough Green does not need development. I moved to Kent because it is the Garden of England.

All communities need a mixed range of housing for old and young families and rural villages should not be exempt from this. There should be a wide range of housing from flats to larger houses to provide a mixed community and avoid the situation in many areas where only the wealthy can afford to live there.  
option 5. Looks like a large development that would remove individual village borders and provide an urban style which is inappropriate for a rural community.

These 2 constraints (GB an AONB) should have been applied by the SA assessment of sites. Only if insufficient sites came through should the strategies 2-5 then be offered.

**Our preference is for a spatial strategy that protects the GB and the AONB.**

The AONB is different to the Green Belt. T&MBC will be unable to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify allocation of land in the AONB which is covered by Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of way Act 2000, i.e. the statutory duty of regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. There is much more land available outside the AONB in the Borough either in or out of the GB. No allocations should be made in the AONB or its setting.

To minimise encroachment into the Green Belt and avoid even further pressure on local infrastructure such as roads, GP surgeries, schools

---

**User Response: Text**

We should maintain as much of the green belt as possible, however there is a clear need to expand urban areas and ensure these are spread around.

I object to any significant development around the Borough Green area as the infrastructure is already at breaking point. The A25 between Wrotham and Sevenoaks is gridlocked in the morning, the doctor's surgery is over capacity (it is extremely difficult to get an appointment) and the local grid is already suffering from power cuts.

It seems to make sense that with the current saturation of the Kings Hill area, that another area of new development should be identified.

Option 1 preserves valuable greenbelt and AONB landscapes while still permitting growth within the established Urban Centres. I might also support Option 2 provided development is prioritised to brown field and windfall development sites without encroachment on green belt

Try asking real questions and use language that everybody can understand

To sustain areas of natural beauty

- With option 1 there is no need to build on greenbelt land
- Option 1 has least negative impact on biodiversity of all the options
- Option 1 is least likely to negatively affect the landscape, quality and character of the borough
- Option 1 would have less negative impact on air quality and emissions than the other options
- Option 1 would likely still provide a good supply of quality housing of varying types/sizes, all without building on greenbelt
- By not developing in the greenbelt outskirts of Tonbridge, there might be less chance of increased traffic at the Watlingbury crossroads caused by people travelling from Tonbridge to Maidstone.

Worst options:

- Option 4 and 5 start to fragment the greenbelt further and risk isolating particular types of animals and reduce wildlife corridors
- Option 4 and 5 have a significant negative impact on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions and therefore climate change
- Option 5 would really carve up the greenbelt with a large area of new settlement

Development should not take place within the greenbelt - the villages in these areas are unique, historic centres without the facilities, infrastructure or capacity to take additional developments. The greenspaces themselves are essential - for biodiversity, for environmental sustainability, to protect the developments we will need from flooding. There should be no reason to damage the green spaces we have when there are clear urban areas that can take additional development without impacting on the spaces we should be protecting.

---

## User Response: Text

A new settlement is the most effective strategy to:

- Minimising the erosion of greenbelt and areas of outstanding beauty. (Utilising brownfield sites and underutilised land should be prioritised and actively encouraged to safeguard greenfield sites and areas of outstanding natural beauty).
- reduce impact on current infrastructure and plan appropriate and adequate infrastructure for new development and population growth.
- minimise impact on biodiversity
  - maintain balance of eco system
  - promote soil formation and protection
  - minimise habitat loss and change
- minimise the disruption to the local communities
- to preserve the setting and special character of existing towns/ villages.
- minimise the likelihood of neighbouring towns/rural service centres merging into one another

This option appears to strike the best realistic balance between protecting designated areas and best use of existing facilities.

It seems unlikely that fragmenting development across a large number of areas would improve the amenities and standard of living for either those in the existing areas or those new as part of the development. Focussing on existing major hubs allows investment and improvement to focus on some key, large scale, areas in the borough - hugely benefitting from the need for fewer separate investments which can therefore be targeted and scaled.

Having, for example 10 smaller development sites across 4 villages is difficult for GP, school and amenity improvements to be made as the financial and practical asks of that are in too many different directions. The most likely outcome is further stretching of already insufficient resources with no benefit. Further buildup of larger scale areas would allow more targeted investment and improvements increasing more likely improving the quality of life for everyone.

In addition to the above, venturing into AONB and significant portions of Green Belt would seem to disregard the very purpose of protecting those areas. If they can be disregarded for the local plan, then it's not clear what their purpose is at all. An extreme example is a site proposal in the call for sites which is for an estate of over 100 homes on a piece of farmland that lies adjacent to the Ightham village sign that says "Welcome to Ightham, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty". Similarly in Ightham significantly sized proposals (20+ homes) less than 250m from the Grade I listed church.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B

Minimise greenbelt erosion and disruption to the existing rural community.

---

### User Response: Text

If development has to be undertaken, it should be concentrated around urban areas which already have the infrastructure in place to support the additional demand that will be created. The borough's roads already struggle to cope with the volume of traffic, particularly around recently developed sites. We are rapidly losing the Kent countryside that we cherish so much, particularly during and since the pandemic.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. Prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
5. assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing greenbelt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The greenbelt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this local plan.

We need to ensure that prior to the need to release of any land from the Green Belt as well as agreeing to any development within a protected landscape, that all suitable land has been built on. Once green belt and protected landscapes are used, they are gone for future generations. We have an obligation to use what we have effectively before we start changing agreed and established areas.

A new settlement is the most effective strategy to:

- Minimising the erosion of greenbelt and areas of outstanding beauty. (Utilising brownfield sites and underutilised land should be prioritised and actively encouraged to safeguard greenfield sites and areas of outstanding natural beauty).
- reduce impact on current infrastructure and plan appropriate and adequate infrastructure for new development and population growth.
- minimise impact on biodiversity
- maintain balance of eco system
- promote soil formation and protection
- minimise habitat loss and change
- minimise the disruption to the local communities
  
- to preserve the setting and special character of existing towns/ villages.
- minimise the likelihood of neighbouring towns/rural service centres merging into one another

A new settlement is the most effective strategy to:

- Minimising the erosion of greenbelt and areas of outstanding beauty. (Utilising brownfield sites and underutilised land should be prioritised and actively encouraged to safeguard greenfield sites and areas of



---

**User Response: Text**

outstanding natural beauty).

- reduce impact on current infrastructure and plan appropriate and adequate infrastructure for new development and population growth.
  - minimise impact on biodiversity
  - maintain balance of eco system
  - promote soil formation and protection
  - minimise habitat loss and change
  - minimise the disruption to the local communities
- 
- to preserve the setting and special character of existing towns/ villages.
  - minimise the likelihood of neighbouring towns/rural service centres merging into one another.

I believe that development should be focused on areas outside of the green belt and areas of natural beauty, and instead the existing urban areas should be considered for expansion.

Firstly, the roads in a lot of rural areas already struggle to cope with the volume of traffic and I believe it would therefore be simpler and more cost effective to spend money improving the roads around existing urban areas, to ensure they are able to cope with the additional traffic.

From personal experience, I know that traffic around Kings Hill and Watlingbury is dreadful at both morning and evening rush hours, making it very difficult to get out of my road and onto the main road. The building of additional houses will only make the roads more dangerous and could even lead to gridlock on occasions.

Secondly, more needs to be done to protect the countryside that led to Kent being known as the garden of England and avoid it becoming the building site of England.

None of these options.

They will all place considerable strain on an already overcrowded road network and healthcare facility in the area including Eccles, Burham & Wouldham.

The bridge built by Trenport is not going to alleviate the issues that building more houses in this area will cause.

To protect vital green belt land (for environmental reasons, agricultural and therefore economic reasons, and wellbeing/quality of life reasons). Existing urban areas already have existing infrastructure in place and potential capacity to increase this without further damage to greenfield land.

Any expansion beyond existing greenbelt boundaries will increase congestion and air quality. Any developments need to respect the Green Belt.

---

**User Response: Text**

Too much development is focused around Kings Hill, Mereworth and West Malling. These settlements are in danger of being combined into one large urban area rather than the unique villages they currently are. For too long this Kings Hill has served the local plan as the development centre. The focus should now move to another area where a similar style of development can be created. Compulsory purchase of land between Shipbourne, Hildenborough and Underriver would make for a much more suitable location with good access to trains and the A21.

Building should be spread out throughout the borough not concentrated in one area. The northern part of TMBC is in danger of becoming one large, merged area rather than the separate villages/towns that they currently are - West Malling, Kings Hill, Mereworth, Wateringbury, Larkfield.

Kings Hill has taken the hit for most of the development in recent years and it's about time other areas are considered for development.

Best use of non green belt land with least hard to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding issues within the borough, which is already an issue in some areas. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent, therefore will naturally create more affordable housing in the borough. More transport links and roads for much of the areas in options 1 & 2. There are many towns with great infrastructure near by.

I am extremely concerned and the potential impact of development within Tonbridge Well Borough council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on the neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned that the development will have a strain / impact on the lives of those already living in the area due to the lack of infrastructure already struggling within the community, such as the NHS. The utility companies such as South East Water already can't modernise existing houses due to lack of infrastructure, for example houses on Westwood Road TN12 5DE can't be put on a water meter. Phone coverage is extremely poor in most parts in the village and lack of infrastructure means property's already struggle with broadband speeds and limited providers.

Developing agglomeration further away from London will help with keeping the jobs locally. House development further away from Green Belt supports this idea.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Urban sprawl must be limited, expanding on existing urban areas will result in a deteriorating quality of life for everyone with even more congested roads and strain on essential services.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

---

**User Response: Text**

2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

It would boost the local economy and community in areas that require it but also can handle the increased numbers of residents and the services/ roads etc this requires.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The greenbelt areas around Tonbridge are there for a reason and comply with the following NPPF requirements

1. to prevent unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging
3. to safeguard the countryside from encroachment
4. to preserve the setting and special characteristics of historic towns
5. to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Expanding Tonbridge further, beyond the green belt boundaries will make congestion worse, adversely affect the air quality and lead to urban sprawl.

---

**User Response: Text**

The greenbelt should be **respected** by this local plan not ignored

As most of the borough is designated green belt it would make sense to concentrate on existing urban areas

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration,by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

We need to protect Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Green Belt.

The cultural aspects of TMBC are on the foundation of preservation of the Green Belt and the AONB. Any infringement on these areas can undermine the unique character of the borough

followed by 2. Reduce the need to invest massively in developing the services within the rural community and to protect the countryside I and others have come to love in the local.

Rural service centers such as Borough Green cannot support further development. New settlements (even remote from the village) would add pressure to the limited existing services and facilities and spoil the environment for existing residents.

The green belt must be preserved to stop urban sprawl, avoid over development and maintain a quality of life for residents

Simply to minimise the building over of areas of countryside. From your point of view I imagine this is an eternal dilemma.

---

**User Response: Text**

The burden on existing highly populated areas has become too great, and their links to surrounding rural life are being lost. If new homes are indeed needed then a completely new centre for population must be found and sustainably developed.

important to develop areas where housing is needed, but protecting the natural environment when the area is sensitive etc

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF.

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

This is a difficult choice but I believe that that developing the urban development focusing on previously developed land, if controlled well and with a focus on good town centre planning and architectural design, then this could bring many benefits to our existing towns. Tonbridge is a historic town, but has a tired high street especially with the challenges of recent years and additional development will bring money into the area, however high rise development is not favourable as the town has beautiful vistas and this will help to protect the heritage of the town and the castle area. Additionally the existing flood barrier protects the town.

Intensification of development within existing well-served settlements will protect the biodiversity and landscape value of the Borough and reduce the overall carbon footprint of development, as well as preserving agricultural for food security

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

---

**User Response: Text**

5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Protects green belt land and areas of outstanding natural beauty. These areas have the relevant infrastructure in place to cope with additional housing such as demands on sewage drains, water supplies, transport.

Your Corporate Strategy recognises that the Local Plan can lead on valuing our environment. The Green Belt and AONB are there for a very good reason. Green and Open spaces are essential for people's physical and mental health (thereby saving pressure on the worn-out NHS); Agriculture for feeding our nation on this small island, less imports thereby helping to mitigate against Climate Change; Trees and Hedgerows protecting against flooding which our area is vulnerable too and providing habitats and food for many species.

Options 1 and 2 maintain the character of the area and have existing road networks and services. The other options look to urbanise what is otherwise a semi-rural area.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

To drive sustainability and ensure modal shift away from the private car, it is vital that strategic growth is focused on the most sustainable locations such as Tonbridge with its wide-range of services and facilities, including rail provision.

In terms of the level of detail available at this stage in the Local Plan development, Medway Council does not have a preference for a particular spatial option. We would ask that at the earliest possible point, when further information is available on preferred sites and options - that we are informed at earliest possible point, in order

---

**User Response: Text**

for Medway Council to be in the position of testing the likely impacts on Medway of any sites/options being taken forward.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF: 1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging. 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

- Existing utility and transport infrastructure in place
- Educational access
- Potential to offer a wider mix of housing or making as greater contribution towards local housing needs
- Fewer heritage sites impacted potentially
- Higher potential for economic benefit

To keep the Green belt intact and ANOB areas,- good for biodiversity and human health and wellbeing.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending

---

**User Response: Text**

nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their local current plan.

To protect the environment and develop a plan that recognises the proven detrimental effects of climate change and unrelenting building development. Increasingly scarce resources, an unknown future for food supply, energy, and water utilities. The current year (2022) has again given proof of what we are facing, viz: record temperatures, water shortages, uncertain weather patterns (high winds and heavy rain/flooding), threatened electricity supply cuts, current affordable food shortages and a UK economy clearly facing serious difficulties. The Plan needs to recognise these issues which will exist into the future rather than relying on increased building/hypothetical commercial benefits as a panacea. I am also very concerned about the concept of mineral extraction before some of the proposed developments (should they ever take place). Flooding is a serious issue for all that live in the Tonbridge and Hildenborough areas and natural drainage should not be compromised.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Developments need to consider the available infrastructure.

Schools, shops, surgeries, leisure centres, transport need to be available and close for every day living.

Pollution is an increasing problem to our health and well being.

Communities thrive when people are happy. Housing needs to be affordable, within a good infrastructure where people can work.

Preservation of the Green Belt is essential as is preservation of land for agricultural purposes. Both should be a legacy for future generations. Once lost they would never be recoverable, so housing needs must be met elsewhere.

The retention of the green belt is important to reduce the spread of build up urban areas, stopping neighbouring towns from encroaching on each other and the surrounding countryside.



---

**User Response: Text**

Retaining the character of historical towns is also important otherwise they just get lost in the over development.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

I appreciate that some new housing needs to be built in Tonbridge and Malling, but I strongly disagree with building on green belt land. Local Brown field sites should be the first place to look to when looking for new housing sites.

Don't wish to see the Green Belt compromised in any way.

The area is already built on with necessary schools, medical facilities, shops and other infrastructure.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan. The expansion of settlements within the existing Green Belt boundaries would result in worsening congestion and air quality, not to mention increasing demand on water sources in the already drought-stricken SE.

In a wider context the housing target set within this local plan contributes to the overdevelopment in the South East. Given the government's levelling up agenda, should some of the housing targets not be shifted to other parts of the country (instead of other parts of the borough or West Kent), alongside with economic stimulus and employment opportunities?

---

### User Response: Text

Option 4 maximises the use of previously-developed land in the borough and supports a wide range of communities. Significant building in any one area, with no development in other areas, threatens the communities (including as a result of coalescence). It is inequitable for build to be focussed on one area and should be shared proportionate to, say, existing populations.

Development should be across the borough and be dispersed according to the size of communities and proportionate to the size of the communities.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Villages like Mereworth should remain a village and not be consumed by housing which would join it to larger settlements like Kings Hill.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. preventtheunrestrictedsprawloflargebuilt-upareas.
2. preventneighbouringtownsmerging.
3. safeguardthecountrysidefromencroachment.
4. preservethesettingandspecialcharacterofhistorictowns.
5. assistinurbanregeneration,byencouragingtherecyclingofderelictand other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

On an assessed need basis.... This seems like the least likely way to create conurbations which would destroy village and hamlet communities. It's not ideal and I would encourage TMBC to continue to lobby HM Government for a reduction in allocation. I believe Kings Hill and West Malling have absorbed a significantly disproportionate volume of new homes in recent decades and a balance needs to be set by enlarging the number of commutable homes within the town of Tonbridge itself (without growing the boundaries of *all* towns in the borough (the alternative provisions all have this as the only way i.e. you can't enlarge Tonbridge without enlarging every other main town)).

---

**User Response: Text**

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

New settlements can be created with all the facilities needed in one place for ease of access and to create a balanced village atmosphere. We need to ensure that we are using what we have effectively before we start changing agreed boundaries. We understand that 117 sites submitted in the call for sites are not on Green belt and these should be considered first.

Preservation of the Green Belt is essential as is preservation of land for agricultural purposes. Both should be a legacy for future generations. Once lost they would never be recoverable, so housing needs must be met elsewhere.

Option 4 allows for development to be spread more or less evenly across the borough across the borough as a whole.

The other options are too focused on developing existing urban sites where the infrastructure is inadequate. There needs to be a more balanced distribution of housing throughout the borough not huge swathes of new housing in 3 or 4 sites.

Leave the MGB and AONB alone

Green belt and agricultural land should be avoided, to preserve the countryside, the character of the village and prevent merging with neighbouring villages

There are already too many new homes in this area and the infrastructure cannot support what we have let alone more. We also need to keep our green belt and areas of outstanding beauty, it is so important to the community

I do not agree with any of the options but have selected this option as other options involve development in smaller rural settlements such as East Malling. East Malling Village is sandwiched between Kings Hill and the Medway gap developments and will suffer as a consequence. I do not consider Kings Hill as a typical urban area as this is a fairly new development in the middle of the countryside. Most developments seem to focus on the north east of the borough with very little in the south and west other than Tonbridge

---

**User Response: Text**

I'd like to protect the green belt

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF which are:

[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

(e) to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration of the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments [Tudeley and Paddock Wood] proposed by TWBC in their current Local Plan.

I believe that green belt and areas of outstanding natural beauty should be protected at all costs as these are the lungs of the borough and hold the majority of the biodiversity for plants, fungi, birds and animals.

I selected the options which has the minimal effects on greenfield spaces, as well as helping to retain the character of the rural villages.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air

---

**User Response: Text**

quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever

All areas within the green belt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in NPPF.

Prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.

Prevent neighbouring towns merging

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

More housing development of housing in RSC without provision of extra services, transport and traffic control is not desirable.

As the plan states this is a 'diverse and characterful place' and any development should seek to preserve this. Some of the proposed sites run very much counter to this by joining up what are currently distinct village settlements. Doesn't the assessed need already include a 23% addition?

Development should be focussed in areas already settled that lie beyond AONB and Greenbelt with the appropriate infrastructure.

It would protect the countryside and wildlife.

Shipbourne is a conservation area of natural beauty and should remain this way. It is a small village and the introduction of further housing to this extent is preposterous. The lanes are narrow and could not cope with more traffic.

Possibly 1. I do not believe we should be building on green belt or any AONOB and that actually we should be extending and protecting more of the areas in the borough.

However, I also think we need to protect the gaps between our urban and rural villages. We currently have an urban sprawl which is seeing this disappear at an increasingly speedy rate.

I do not think the current house building target is sustainable.

---

**User Response: Text**

Green belt is supposed to be protected. It is the reason we have paid such high prices for our houses because they are near precious land for leisure, countryside enjoyment, views, fresh air and to enjoy the innate character of our country's landscape. This has become even more important to our mental health and wellbeing since Covid. Crowded, traffic-filled roads and lack of basic services for the existing town/village populations require easing, not making worse. Therefore, new settlements away from green belt land should be planned, not squeezing more housing into existing towns.

Protection of the green belt and rural areas.

Option 3 would spread development across different parts of the borough, rather than concentrating it in just one or two corners. It also seems to be the most sustainable option because it would focus new development in accessible locations near to existing service hubs and would provide the greatest opportunities for contributions from more than one development to combine towards investment in new infrastructure. However, we also consider that there should be leeway for some minor or modest development in smaller settlements so long as this respects the character of the village, does not harm the community and amenity, and maintains green space around and between different villages.

It balances the development across different areas rather than all in one area.

It seems to involve the least green field sites.

Uses the existing infrastructure

Green belt should be protected

If you start building on the green belt/ AONB, where does it stop? Eventually everything will merge into one big sprawling mass. We need to protect the green belt and ANOB and the biodiversity they support.

Even though I live in Tonbridge and this would mean losing maybe areas that would affect where I live, I feel it is the lesser of the 5 evils spreading the burden as far as possible without intruding totally on the small villages where once they are encroached upon it will never stop and we will lose all of our beautiful green spaces. I don't agree with any of the options really but if we have to choose then a sacrifice has to be made somewhere. I do feel the number of houses we are being forced to build is far too many but we all need to be able to still appreciate the beautiful countryside around us. The infra structure is already in place, bursting at the seams but it is there, it can be added to and therefore would possibly be the cheapest and easiest option to expand.

---

**User Response: Text**

Avoidance of village boundaries merging. Maintenance of existing & historic village characteristics. Damage to and reduction of high grade agricultural & green belt land. Reduces over-development which is already impacting the village of West Malling and surrounding areas

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF: -

- a) prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- b) prevent neighbouring town merging
- c) safeguard the countryside from encroachment
- d) preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- e) assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Green Belt is there for a reason and that reason hasn't changed.

I do not want any of the Green Belt to be taken away for the development of houses, businesses or public amenities., nor any of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to be encroached on.

I do not want any farming land to be used for housing because we will need to grow more of our own produce in the coming years, and these farm lands often abut the Green Belt and AONB.

Having chosen to live in a rural village setting, the building of inappropriate housing that does not fit into the character of the area is to destroy the very nature of our Kent villages which reflect the need of quiet , the need of fresh air, the need of exercise, the sight of the night sky and of bats , and the sound of owls calling. Extra lighting from more houses in Ightham and Ivy Hatch All these things define the word 'rural'

---

**User Response: Text**

I have explained my reasoning in the comments box

It is imperative that we protect the Green Belt and the character of the towns and villages within it that gives the borough its unique and appealing character. Focussing development on areas like the Medway Gap and Kings Hill will allow investment in those areas of Transport, Schools and infrastructure that will be of benefit to current and future residents, thus maximising the investment and benefits

Many people like to live in urban environments which are set up for supporting a higher density and level of population. Increasing these settlements will be less intrusive and more practical than completely changing the nature and character of rural environments that has residents who have significantly chosen to live in those kind of environments.

The NO2 levels in Watringbury are the highest in the Borough. They far exceed the legal limits and yet the consultation allows the prospect of tripling the homes in the area.

The infrastructure and services already provided in urban areas, rural service centres (and other rural settlements, if any) is already over-stretched. Attempts to expand capacity to cover the greater needs as a result of development would be disruptive and expensive. Better to plan from scratch in the areas outside the GB and ANOB. This approach would also provide a major opportunity to design developments in such a way as to meet as many Sustainability Appraisal Objectives as possible. These would include specific over-arching issues that must be addressed before any house construction is considered in detail. For example Road Capacity, Public Transport, Air Quality, Supporting and Social Infrastructure (see above).

Urban areas have existing infrastructure already developed or relatively easily extended to benefit a large number of people. Road and rail links in Tonbridge, Snodland and the Medway Gap have in several instances already been much improved. Extending development into rural service centres and / or other rural settlements will mean that the cost of improving all aspects of infrastructure (roads, buses, rail, schools, surgeries, retail, entertainment etc) will be prohibitive, or not cost effective and thus won't be done.

The new lower Thames crossing is planning on using road links onto the A227, which is already over congested, has multiple speeding restrictions and no possibility of improvement - in particular consider the A227 from Meopham to Wrotham, through Brough Green to Ightham, Shipbourne and Tonbridge.

Where we live in Mereworth, we're shocked to see the proposals to build on the fields that surround our house. We moved to the village to live in the countryside for our wellbeing, not to be surrounded by houses. The roads in Mereworth are congested enough as it is and we as well as many of our neighbours feel they could not cope with any more burden. My own car as well as my next door neighbours have both been damaged by other drivers due to the congestion that builds up in the village. It's already at breaking point at peak times and this isn't helped by the village being used as a rat run by residents in surrounding villages and Kings Hill. More housing in our local area as well as the Watringbury sites will only make this situation even worse.

We have a community to protect in our small village and do not want hundreds of houses to be built around us.



---

**User Response: Text**

We also worry about the impact this would have on the value of our home, both in respect of our property being appealing to those wanting to live in the countryside surrounded by fields and also if the congestion on the roads worsened, the village would become unattractive to live in. By building on the land surrounding our village, you'll be removing the open space that we treasure and reduce our quality of life.

Because it is essential to protect the Green Belt and AONB. Development within these areas would have a significant adverse effect on the natural beauty and resources within Tonbridge and Malling. It is important to protect, conserve and enhance this for future generations.

green belt and areas of outstanding Natural Beauty must be protected at all cost.

minimise construction in green belt/area of outstanding natural beauty

infrastructure upgrade costs in green belt areas and rural areas will be significant which will have a detrimental impact on the affordability of housing

- 1) I think it is important to protect green belt land as an important amenity for the population of the area
- 2) Farm land should be protected as the current cost of living crisis shows the importance that this country grows as much of its own food as possible. Also to reduce the global warming effect of 'food miles' we should be growing as much as possible locally.
- 3) By concentrating development, where possible, within existing urban areas people will be living closer to the amenities that they use with a reduced need for car use and the possibility that public transport can be improved.
- 4) As somebody who lives in a property in Brookmead Hildenborough which has suffered from flash flooding 4 times since 2009 there is a need not to put additional strain on the drainage infrastructure in areas where it is struggling to cope with the increasing number of extreme weather events as a result of global warming.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air

---

**User Response: Text**

quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Option 4 will allow the distribution of housing growth across the Borough that will also disperse the effects of development, rather than focus this predominantly on a single area – which could ultimately lead to negative impacts such as traffic congestion, noise and air pollution and stretched community resources/infrastructure – for example.

Such an approach will also ensure the spatial strategy accords with paragraph 68 of the NPPF in allocating “*a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability*”. Subsequently, this will provide the basis for the Council to deliver a robust 5YHLS by allocating specific and deliverable sites.

N/a

I am concerned with the growth of large urban areas, and the currently poor infrastructure (doctors, schools, public transport etc) - in addition to the impact that the lack of green areas has on our communities and mental health.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge meet the requirements set out in the NPPF 13 regarding protecting green belt land

Green Belt and AONB sites should never be authorised unless all other avenues have been exhausted.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

You should not build on greenbelt land.

---

**User Response: Text**

Minimise future damage to greenbelt areas and disruption to the existing rural community.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

We believe that Option 4 allows for a better balance of development across the borough and gives people more options as to where to live. It would also allow for the provision of better services (facilities, houses and jobs) to the smaller villages and communities and would probably lower the amount of travel required within the borough.

TMBC is a unique and beautiful, yet well-functioning and supportive, area of the country with a great balance of towns, villages and countryside. The Options presented boil down to: maintaining and enhancing this (Option 1) seeking to avoid the need to release of any land from the Green Belt as well as avoiding development within a protected landscape; destroying this beauty slowly (Options 2 and 3) by expanding the urban areas significantly; or destroying this beauty quickly (Option 4 and 5) by urbanising any area that looks vaguely viable. Option1 is therefore the only one that seeks to maintain the integrity of this unique and beautiful area of the country.

The people of this borough by and large live here because we choose to do so. A significant part of why we choose to live here is its essentially rural character, in particular as a result of the green belt. If we wanted to live in a city we could move a few miles into London, one of the greatest and most exciting conurbations in the history of humanity. The fact that we do not move (and indeed why many of us have moved from London to here) shows how much we value this borough as it is, with its green belt intact.

---

**User Response: Text**

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would allow for further development to be spread most evenly across the entire borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport links, local road networks and essential services in Kings Hill and Malling are not currently able to cope, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan settlements.

Strategy Option 3 - Urban and Rural Service Centres: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas and rural service centre settlements.

Strategy Option 4 - Distributed: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements to support a range of communities.

Strategy Option 5 - New Settlement: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, as well as a new settlement/s

Reduce impact on infrastructure and erosion of green belt.

I think that all communities need housing for young families from the locality and see no reason why rural villages should be exempt. There should be a range of housing, including 1 and 2 bed flats and affordable starter homes. Not 5-bed executive housing. The amount of development should be proportionate to the size of the settlement. Option 5 appears to be Borough Green Garden City, which is an option that urbanises the area forming continuous development between Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green and North Ightham

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

---

**User Response: Text**

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. preventtheunrestrictedsprawloflargebuilt-upareas.
2. preventneighbouringtownsmerging.
3. safeguardthecountrysidefromencroachment.
4. preservethesettingandspecialcharacterofhistorictowns.
5. assistinurbanregeneration,byencouragingtherecyclingofderelictand other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Seems to have a clear focus, without impacting greenbelt land, and near existing major roads/motorways. Consideration should be given to creating link to High Speed Rail which runs north of borough as this would provide major benefits to existing and new developments in this part of borough.

Protection of the Metropolitan Green Belt and avoiding development in AONB

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

**OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing**

---

**User Response: Text**

Preserves greenbelt and prevents encroachment of urban areas into the countryside

Use existing brownfield / other urban land for development

Concern that further development around Tonbridge will put pressure on out of town roads and infrastructure

It focuses development in areas that would not be spoiled by extended development.

It avoids a strategy of trying to identify many small development sites that would maximise local anger for minimal gain in housing numbers.

it also allows the planners to require developers to include certain amenities, if the site numbers are larger (economies of scale and all that)

The green belt and areas of natural beauty are precious and should be treated as sacrosanct when considering large scale development. Option four is second for me, affordable housing is clearly needed in all rural areas (evenly key).

The development needs should be spread across our community.

If I've read it correctly - because I don't agree with building on any greenbelt land.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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

---

**User Response: Text**

other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Make use of existing developed areas, infrastructure and roads and don't eat into new countryside

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

It would appear from what I've read and can deduce from the diagram that this option restricts development to existing urban areas where there is a more robust existing infrastructure, road network, public transport,

---

**User Response: Text**

opportunities for local employment and the least impact on arable land and countryside within the borough.

Preserve the character and livelihoods of villages where infrastructure is not and never could be fit for development. Preserve agricultural land and resource. Developing already developed 'urban' environments will require less upgrade of services, roads and other infrastructure. Protect AONB and outdoor spaces which is ever proving to improve the livelihoods of physical and mental health.

This option seems to balance distributing development widely across the borough with the limitations of transport infrastructure in the more rural areas. Development around small settlements which have limited services and small roadways doesn't make sense.

Strategy Option 2 takes advantage of the services already provided by urban areas: schools, healthcare, shops, decent public transport links etc that would be needed by a development of this scale. It provides a sustainable development opportunity whilst ensuring the least negative impact on the environment.

AONBs and Green Belt must be protected.

Focus should be on existing urban sites with services, to minimise need for car journeys and to protect countryside.

Do not support development around "rural service centres" without a significant improvement in public transport, which this Local Plan definitely is not offering.

*West Malling is an area of outstanding beauty and there are other options for development which do not involve building on greenfield and greenbelt sites. We should be seeking to concentrate development outside of greenfield and greenbelt sites and not on grade 1 agricultural land.*

West Malling is in danger of merging into Kings Hill and losing its historical character. It is important to maintain village boundaries, in particular the boundary between Kings Hill and West Malling as they have such different characters.

We need to safeguard the countryside, which proved to be so important for people's mental and physical health during Covid and continues to be.

We need to preserve the setting and special character of our historic village of West Malling.

Developing in areas which already have access to transport/education and medical services makes more sense. The east bank of the river relies too heavily on services outside the borough i.e. Maidstone and Medway hospitals, secondary schools etc and would require a huge amount of infrastructure improvement to accommodate any more development.



---

**User Response: Text**

However, we feel that the Snodland area has already been over-developed with little regard to ensuring adequate infrastructure, economic opportunity or quality of life.

**FECL Preferred Option:**

It is considered that there will be no single spatial option that should be pursued. The intensification/densification option must be considered to accord with national guidance (on the reuse of previously developed land and before land is released from the Green Belt) but it will not deliver sufficient quantities of land to meet the required development needs.

The intensification option is also likely to be limited in historic city and town centres where historic assets will need to be protected. It is also likely that there will be infrastructure capacity issues associated with significant levels of new development within existing settlements e.g. schools and health services already at capacity with limited scope to expand. The likely yield from this land source must be rigorously tested to make sure it is reliable for development and not over-stated.

A mixed spatial option is likely to be the most sustainable and deliverable option. FECL consider that should first establish the capacity of the main towns to accommodate further expansion and focus on extending existing urban areas in locations where new communities can enhance and improve infrastructure provision and create sustainable communities (i.e. Option 2). This should also prioritise the best-connected places to maximise and improve the existing infrastructure where available. This must include a focus on Tonbridge as a priority to reflect its role as the largest settlement and its location in the southern HMA.

Beyond this, and depending on the scale of growth to be accommodated, FECL support some limited dispersed growth across smaller settlements before new standalone settlements are considered.

We set out our comments on each option under a separate comment due to word restrictions.

Adding housing to Option 1 is will retain the greenbelt and AOB. Facilities e.g schooling, healthcare doctors is already over stretched in the rural areas and roads . traffic will not cope.

See response to Q2

We shouldn't be building on our green spaces, they will never get replaced. The developers will cut down 100s of trees that are hundreds of years old and only plant a handful more.

Option 1 seems to copy TWBC's approach of dumping all the housing on the edge of the boundary, which is inequitable and will put huge strain on that settlement.

---

## User Response: Text

Option 5 seems to be a free for all.

Option 3 seems the best compromise, but care needs to be taken to maintain the areas characteristics. For example, this looks to further increase the creep of Tonbridge into Hildenborough. Space needs to be maintained and quality of housing and infrastructure needs to be considered beyond just numbers.

Any building development that does not use green belt or AONB is essential. this would protect these areas for future generations

The Green Belt and areas of outstanding natural beauty (AONBs) are part of the cultural heritage of Kent. The landscape is part of the county's identity and its' connection to the land.

By conserving the Green Belt and AONBs, biodiversity is maintained and restored, climate change mitigated, and physical and mental health supported.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

1. Option 3 is favoured as it seeks to deliver development within the most sustainable locations i.e. the two upper tiers of the Settlement Hierarchy and also recognises that new development outside of these existing settlements, adjoining and so well related to the existing built edges will be required in order to meet the Boroughs housing requirements.
1. This option best reflects the findings of the Housing Market Delivery Study (GL Hearn July 2022). In this regard, as the Council is aware this concludes that whilst the overall annual housing requirement is 839 dwellings per annum (dpa), some 478 of this need is generated within the Maidstone Housing Market Area (HMA) and 361 within the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA. Option 3 proposes to focus development around three of the upper tier settlements in the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA, (Tonbridge, Hildenborough and Hadlow) and then around seven settlements / areas in the Maidstone HMA (Borough Green, Snodland, Medway Gap, Kings Hill, Walderslade, East Peckham and West Malling) reflecting the greater need in the Maidstone HMA.
1. Option 3 performs well, and potentially is the most sustainable option (alongside option 2) as assessed within the Interim Sustainability Report (LUC, August 2022). It scores particularly well in terms of key Objective 4 '*To encourage sustainable economic growth, business development, and economic inclusion across the borough*' and 14 '*To provide a suitable supply of high quality housing including an appropriate mix of sizes, types and tenures*'.
1. Option 1 in is not favoured as this disregards issues of locational sustainability and housing need and simply proposes that development is located in areas not currently designated as Green Belt or AONB. As the draft plan notes (Table 1) 70% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt and 26.84% AONB (with some crossover), which means that if this option were to be followed this would leave only very limited locations for growth, unrelated to existing infrastructure, facilities and principles of good planning and sustainability.

---

## User Response: Text

1. Option 2 whilst performing well (similar to Option 3) in the Sustainability Appraisal is not supported as it would result in too narrow a focus on tier one settlements only and would as a result mean that large areas of the borough including very sustainable settlements (Rural Service Centres) do not benefit from any growth at all.
1. To ignore the Rural Service Centres would be contrary to paragraph 79 of the NPPF which advises that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The NPPF notes that opportunities for growth should be supported where this will support local services.
1. Option 2 would similarly run contrary to the advice at paragraphs 62 and 63 of the NPPF which make clear that affordable housing needs should be met in the areas that they occur. Clearly delivery of new homes in only a very small number of locations would not address the wider affordable housing needs of the borough. For example a need for affordable homes in Borough Green could not be satisfactorily addressed in Tonbridge or The Medway Gap.
1. Option 4 is considered the second most appropriate strategy after Option 3. This is on the basis that it includes a number of the benefits that are delivered by Option 3. However we hold concerns that this option raises the potential for some quite dispersed development within smaller settlements with limited public transport opportunities and so the need to travel further using less sustainable modes. These concerns are highlighted within the Sustainability Appraisal where the option scores poorly in terms of access to facilities (SA 2) and reducing greenhouse gases (SA 10).
1. Option 5 relies upon urban sites within existing settlements and also the delivery of at least one new settlement away from existing centres.
1. Many of the urban sites are noted within the Urban Capacity Study (Urban Intelligence - July 2022), as being in existing use as either car parks or amenity land.
1. Given the sites have existing uses and some were previously identified in the last local plan but have failed to come forward it is considered that there would be significant risk in relying on a substantial portion of development from these sites.
1. That aside, even if all 75 sites were to come forward as set out in the Urban Capacity Study this would deliver just under 2,000 new homes.
1. This would in turn leave approximately 7,245 (Table 2 of the local plan) as still being required to be allocated in the period to 2040. This is a substantial number to achieve from one or even two new settlements in the time available.
1. Whilst new settlements can assist in delivering sustainable new development alongside new infrastructure this option would leave the plan heavily reliant upon them and very likely to fail if, as is often the case, they deliver at significantly slower rates than hoped / predicted. This option would not in our view include sufficient flexibility and contingency as the basis for a sound plan.
15. The option also performs relatively poorly against the others in terms of the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.

---

**User Response: Text**

Development option 1 is for areas that are not in the green belt or AONB. In addition this area falls outside areas likely to be flooded more frequently due to intensification of precipitation.

Building on the green belt increases the risk of flooding as by building on fields which currently absorb water therefore help with water management.

Existing wildlife habitats would be destroyed.

Rural businesses are affected - farms and animal business have many business servicing them such as feed merchants, vets, farriers.

Positive well-being - by building onto existing developments the infrastructure for travel, shops, social are available without car use.

We need to look after our countryside and respect what we have.

Fits local needs best and avoids further sprawl

I am aware that we need to protect the greenfield sites before they are lost. To enable enjoyment of the outside space and environment. providing walking/cycling routes for families with older and younger generations. But also needs to be able to provide things like schools, healthcare facilities so the current ones aren't overstretched. But also need to provide infrastructure for more schools, for the children living in the "new" houses.

ALL farmland and Greenbelt land MUST be saved from development to ensure a future for our children!

we need to produce much more of our own food and rewild our green spaces therefore massive housing schemes are completely wrong for our future survival

Green jobs should be created

The respondent strongly supports the principle of densification and feel that it should play a leading role in the meeting the Housing Needs of Tonbridge & Malling's residents. Substantial weight is attributed to the use of brownfield land within settlements in Paragraph 118 of the NPPF.

Sheltered Housing and Extra Care are characterised as being high density, efficient developments located within existing communities in sustainable locations within walking distance of shops and services and are typically windfall sites on previously developed land.

Policies that encourage the delivery of specialist older persons' accommodation will facilitate building at higher densities in sustainable locations accordingly.

---

**User Response: Text**

Expanding Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green belt is there for a reason- to stop urban sprawl and the Local Plan should honour this.

We should comply with the NPPF:

Prevent urban sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns merging

Safeguard the countryside

Preserve the history and character of historic towns

Assist in urban generation by recycling existing derelict land and buildings

- To protect the valuable rural character of Tonbridge & Malling Borough we support Option 1 or Option 2.
- We do not support Option 3 (focus on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and rural service centres), Option 4 (focus on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements) or Option 5 (focus on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, thereby seeking to maximise the use of previously-developed land in the borough, as well as a new settlement/s remote from existing towns and villages) all of which would have a major impact on Offham including its rural character, and landscape the health and wellbeing of its local residents.
- By pursuing Option 1 or Option 2, the Sustainability Appraisal objectives by which sites are assessed can best be achieved through access to education and community facilities, proximity to public transport, through support of health and wellbeing and by protecting important health, environment, landscape and natural assets, valuing the distinct rural character of the area enjoyed by those living in both the Borough's towns and its villages.
- Offham has one bus a day - the school bus to Wrotham is about to be stopped and the one public bus may also cease soon so the council is considering taking away our current very very limited public transport.
- There is now no GP service in West Malling, so for local residents of Offham, West Malling, the nearest GP is in Kings Hill or Leybourne where one needs to drive.

The infrastructure can all be created in once place with minimal disruption to already contentious community facilities and infrastructure that is in desperate need of improvements.

To maintain vibrant mixed communities and support localised services and businesses.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original

---

### User Response: Text

brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development. Additionally, concentrating development in smaller parts of the borough puts a disproportionate health risk from construction on those areas. Breathing in all the construction dust for many more years to come has got to have a detrimental effect on our lungs. HSE <https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/cis36.pdf> . The opening paragraph on their page relating to dust construction: "Construction dust is not just a nuisance; it can seriously damage your health and some types can eventually even kill. Regularly breathing these dusts over a long time can therefore cause life-changing lung diseases"

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

This option protects the current green belt and areas of outstanding natural beauty, and should minimise the impact on current traffic hotspots, the development being close to new road infrastructure, the M2, M26 and M20 motorways, and having access to multiple train stations.

Comments like "This seeks to locate development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities" show a lack of understanding of the existing areas that the other options look to increase the size of. Services and existing infrastructure is already strained, especially in the "Urban" areas placed in the hierarchy, the better option would be to start from scratch in other, preferably brownfield, areas. Allowing the larger conurbations to expand and merge with one-another will only exacerbate social problems within these areas. Keeping development areas small with green areas between and distributing traffic/people is far preferable to putting all eggs in one basket and hoping the ones at the bottom don't break.

Strategy Option 3 provides the most sustainable strategy for development by focusing development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities, as well as meeting the needs of a wider range of communities in accessible locations. The other strategies would either overly concentrate development solely in Urban Areas, or create a new settlement remote from public transport links and existing services.

Strategy Options 1 and 2 would also focus too great a quantum of development solely within the Maidstone HMA to the extent that it would not align with the evidence produced in the Housing Market Delivery Strategy (July 2022) and distribution of development within the Maidstone Housing Market Area (HMA) and the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA.

Only Strategy Options 3 and 4 would meet the needs of both HMAs and provides homes in a range settlements within the Borough. With Option 3 focusing development in the most sustainable locations within the Borough, where they are better served by supporting infrastructure.

---

**User Response: Text**

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

The risk to public safety with access in narrow country lanes .

Disturbing greenbelt land.

The overcrowding of a small village with very limited resources, including one very small school.

The infrastructure in small villages like Hildenborough does not allow for any more housing.

We need to see new Urban settlements to follow the success of Kings Hill which provides several thousand houses, with a wide range of accommodation and affordability.

A new settlement space should include shops, surgeries, primary and senior schools, commercial space so there is opportunity for some residents to work within the settlement, cycle lanes, EV charging points, parks, sports facilities etc.

This is hugely preferable to continuing to allow small developers to infill village areas where there is no provision for any of the above, along with the critical need for drainage, mains water, gas, solar, and parking and new roads.

Purpose made new settlements as St Peter's can be created with all the facilities needed to form a balanced village atmosphere. Issues such as access, cycle lanes and parking can be designed into the layout.

Reference is made to 117 sites submitted in the Call for Sites these not being on Green Belt land and should be considered first.

Option 4 We think that all communities need housing for young families from the locality and see no reason why rural villages should be exempt. There should be a range of housing, including 1 and 2 bed flats and affordable starter homes. Not just 5-bed executive housing. The amount of development should be proportionate to the size of the settlement.

Following on from my comments to 2 above, as it is important to concentrate development in nucleated settlements so as to avoid suburbanisation of the countryside. However, there should be caveats. All development should be at a much higher level of density with restrictions on, for example, the availability of private parking (a maximum of two cars per house?). Use of terrace and semi-detached housing with a much more urban feel would allow more new houses per area of land, and their provision at a lower price. There should also not be any erosion of existing amenity land and intensifying development should not be at the expense of existing buildings of historic interest, scheduled ancient monuments or ancient woodland, protection of which should be improved. Policies put in place by the Labour Government but repealed by the Coalition after 2010 might act as a good

---

**User Response: Text**

guide.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF: 1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging. 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

The proposed development sites on the Tonbridge/Hildenborough border on Green Belt are not infill within the village and will effectively remove any demarcation between the town and the village. Hildenborough will become part of the town forever and will completely lose its identity.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1. I believe that the assessed need is already too high - it is based on out of date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Brexit and Covid. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services

All areas within the Green Belt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF.

1. Prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large build up areas.
2. Prevent neighbouring towns merging so they retain their identities.
3. Safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Once built on, the land has gone forever.
4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality, with resulting damage to health. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

The Greenbelt must be protected to prevent urban sprawl. Once it has gone we won't get it back.

It is important that the plan complies with the NPPF. I don't want to see all the little villages around Tonbridge merge into one sprawling settlement, nor do I want Kings Hill to merge into the Aylesford/Ditton area. I want development around existing facilities made best use of, this may mean redeveloping existing single storey sites such as Tonbridge Sainsbury/Angel centre into 2 or 3 storey mixed use developments. It may mean building around Hildenborough train station and going into some green belt



---

**User Response: Text**

All areas within been belt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in NPPF. We would like to especially highlight

1. Prevent unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
2. Safeguard countryside from encroachment

If Tonbridge is expanded beyond Green belt boundaries, it will only result in worsening air pollution and congestion and extreme pressure on infrastructure. The purpose of Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and it has to be upheld and respected by this local plan.

Any new developments must not destroy the natural environment that we are lucky enough to still enjoy in parts of the Borough.

**FECL Preferred Option:**

It is considered that there will be a hybrid spatial option that should be pursued. An urban focussed strategy (i.e. Option 2) should be prioritised to accommodate the bulk of the growth requirements. The intensification/densification option must be considered to accord with national guidance (on the reuse of previously developed land and before land is released from the Green Belt) but it will not deliver sufficient quantities of land to meet the required development needs.

The intensification option is also likely to be limited in historic city and town centres where historic assets will need to be protected. It is also likely that there will be infrastructure capacity issues associated with significant levels of new development within existing settlements e.g. schools and health services already at capacity with limited scope to expand. The likely yield from this land source must be rigorously tested to make sure it is reliable for development and not over-stated.

A mixed spatial option is likely to be the most sustainable and deliverable option. FECL consider that should first establish the capacity of the main towns to accommodate further expansion and focus on extending existing urban areas in locations where new communities can enhance and improve infrastructure provision and create sustainable communities. This should also prioritise the best-connected places to maximise and improve the existing infrastructure where available. This must include a focus on Tonbridge as a priority to reflect its role as the largest settlement and its location in the southern HMA.

Beyond this, FECL support some limited dispersed growth in villages where there is identified needs before new standalone settlements are considered. These should be non-strategic, small sites.

We recommend Option 3 is the preferred option for the new Local Plan.

*1) Option 3 promotes sustainable development in the Borough*

Option 3 directs development towards Urban Areas and Rural Service Centres which have the best range of key services and facilities, and levels of accessibility, therefore promoting sustainable patterns of development.

---

## User Response: Text

### 2) Option 3 ensures a dispersed pattern of growth

Option 3 is a dispersed approach to distributing development and ensures a balanced distribution of growth. It is more likely to lead to the achievement of meeting a wider range of housing (and other development needs) in full, because development is focused in the most sustainable and established locations. This approach contributes towards achieving sustainable patterns of development.

### 3) Option 3 ensures a balanced distribution of development across 2 HMA's

Option 3 ensures a balanced level of development is distributed between the two Housing Market Areas ('HMA's'). It identifies settlements across both West Kent and Maidstone HMA's ensuring that development can be delivered where it is needed the most. This balance is also essential given the Council's Housing Market Delivery Study states that the Maidstone HMA will not be able to absorb future housing supply in full independently.

### 4) Limited opportunity to develop within existing settlement confines

Urban Capacity Study, states only 75 sites in the Borough have been identified as having potential for redevelopment within urban areas and Rural Service Centres, with an overall capacity of 1,946 dwellings. This is c.2 years of the draft housing requirement (based on 839 dwellings per annum (dpa) and is not sufficient to meet the Council's housing and employment needs in the Borough.

The SA also acknowledges the limited opportunity to develop in urban areas and the need to consider greenfield development. Para. 4.19 of the SA states that "*the Council believes that it will need to consider the use of greenfield sites, within and beyond existing built-up areas to meet its objectively assessed need*". We agree with this view and expect the new Local Plan to bring forward greenfield / Green Belt sites to help meet local development needs.

### 5) Option 3 would require minor alterations to the Green Belt only and EC's exist to do so

Option 3 involves focusing development at land adjoining existing urban areas and rural service centres. Given the Green Belt boundaries are tightly drawn around these settlements, Option 3 would require minor alterations to the Green Belt to fulfil this spatial strategy option. Exceptional Circumstances ('EC's') exist at a strategic level to alter Green Belt boundaries to help meet this assessed development needs. This is also supported by the Council's evidence base, notably the EC's Topic Paper (July 2022) which concludes that EC's exist to amend the Green Belt boundaries.

We also consider that these alterations to the Green Belt to fulfil Option 3 could only be minor and be tightly drawn around small extensions to the settlement, rather than releasing large swathes of the Green Belt in unsustainable locations.

We recommend that a review of the Green Belt boundaries is undertaken, and Court Lane Nurseries is released from the Green Belt to meet development needs.

### 6) Option 3 would ensure a wide range of sites

Option 3 would ensure a wide range of sites are allocated, for example brownfield, greenfield and previously developed land, which can also be delivered across different timescales (for example smaller sites in the short term / first 5 years).

---

**User Response: Text**

Through allocating a wide range of sites, this will ensure the Council can avoid using a stepped trajectory and ensure delivery is consistent throughout the Plan Period. This will also ensure a wide range of housing types for example houses, flats, self-build, specialist etc.

Option 3 also supports the Council's Housing Market Delivery Study which identifies that the Borough needs more small - medium sized sites as it encourages a more dispersed strategy.

7) Less or no-reliance on strategic sites to achieve development needs

Option 3 would ensure a range and mix of sites are provided, and does not rely on larger strategic sites, including a new settlement to be delivered. We support this approach given the build out rates of new settlements.

New settlements can be more challenging to bring forward and can take time to deliver. It can take between 5 and 8 years for large sites to come forward (Lichfields Start to Finish Report) and delivery rates of sites between 1,500 and 1,999 new homes are between 50 – 200 dpa. It is more reliable to allocate sites that contribute to the housing target consistently throughout the Plan period.

8) Windfall approach to development covers all settlements

The proposed approach to small and large windfall sites allows for development to take place at all settlements, including lower tier locations. This helps ensure that new development can come forward across the Borough that is commensurate with the size of each settlement and that site allocations are not necessarily required in all settlements.

No response

Minimal effect on Green Belt and AONB.

There will always be a need for development no matter what for as long as people have children and people move to the UK seeking better opportunities. Only allowing development in non-designated areas will put too much pressure, both literally and policy wise, to develop those areas beyond what is appropriate.

Green Belt was designed to stop London sprawling as development at the time was centered around low density, car dependent settlements. However this has resulted in hugely inflated property prices from capped supply whilst overloading areas which are not Green Belt like Maidstone.

Allowing 'some' development across all settlements around the borough, especially those which are accessible like Tonbridge or Borough Green, will distribute the need more evenly. I did not pick option 5 though as that would seem to lead to large developments in the middle of nowhere with no facilities.

Spatial Option 2 represents the most appropriate option and is justified by the Council's evidence and by other considerations.

Our response to Q2 supports the use of the existing settlement hierarchy as a basis for the Plan's growth strategy.

---

## User Response: Text

Option 2 is a best-fit for that hierarchy and should therefore form the basis of the Council's approach to accommodating growth.

Option 2 recognises that existing urban areas, particularly those at the higher tiers of the settlement hierarchy, offer the best prospects for delivering sustainable growth. New development should be well-related to existing communities, strengthening and supporting existing social structures. New development can support existing facilities, and can fund or deliver expansion or additional facilities to the benefit of new as well as existing residents, including offering support for marginal services. In addition, development focussed around existing urban areas – where sustainable transport options are most widely available – ensures the greatest prospects for sustainable travel choices being available to residents early.

Our response to Q.2 set out why the urban areas – particularly Snodland – in the north east of the Borough are best suited to meeting housing need. The comparative analysis undertaken by the interim Sustainability Appraisal Report ('the iSA') supports that view, demonstrating that Option 2 performs better than other alternatives (including Option 3, which performs similarly on all but Objective 9, for which Option 2 scores better).

Other factors support Option 2 being the preferred spatial strategy option, including settlement-specific factors which will inform the detailed distribution of development to existing urban areas.

The Housing Needs Study 2022 ('HNS') demonstrates that there are specific needs to be addressed by the Plan, including particularly the need to ensure that new dwelling stock is provided in a mix of sizes and tenures to address existing deficiencies, and that affordability represents a significant barrier to home ownership and private rental opportunities, including acutely in Snodland. The need to respond to the separate HMAs also supports Option 2, given that a focus on urban areas offers the best prospect of addressing those needs.

The Housing Market Delivery Study ('HMDS') demonstrates that larger sites are able to deliver quicker than smaller sites. Unconstrained sites offer the prospects of the quickest delivery rates. The availability of suitable deliverable sites is therefore also a factor in determining which growth option is best suited to meeting the demonstrable needs of the Borough. Our responses to other elements of the Plan (notably question 8) demonstrate that we consider that the site of the Medway Cement Works is able to underpin the delivery of strategic growth at Snodland, supporting Spatial Strategy Option 2.

Other options fail to offer the benefits that Option 2 provides.

Option 1 is inconsistent with the Council's evidence that Green Belt releases are justified to meet housing need (notably the conclusions at section 4 of the Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment, July 2022). Given that significant parts of the Borough are subject to Green Belt designation, a blanket policy restriction risks ruling out potential development sites which offer advantages and which perform comparatively better against wider social, economic and environmental objectives and which, other than being within the green belt, offer the best prospects for securing the Plan's overall objectives.

Option 3, although it performs comparatively to Option 2 in the iSA, has the potential to perform less well against SA objective 9. In our view, Option 3 risks diluting the advantages which would be secured under Option 2 by means of reducing the potential for larger strategic sites to deliver quickly, and relying on smaller settlements whose facilities are not as well geared to new development or where there is insufficient capacity to accept growth.

Options 4 and 5 perform poorly in the iSA, particularly against objectives which relate to social, housing and

---

**User Response: Text**

economic factors. As development is distributed to smaller settlements – contrary to the advantages of upholding the existing settlement hierarchy – it becomes increasingly likely that growth will rely on smaller piecemeal development opportunities which result in slower and less sustainable growth.

In our view, Spatial Option 2 provides the best means of securing the Plan’s overall objectives in a way which offers the best prospects for sustainable growth, as evidenced by the iSA.

To meet local housing and employment needs across the borough.

This is an area of outstanding natural beauty and very concerned that insensitive development of rural areas will cause that to be lost. The road infrastructure around the area I live in in West Peckham and Mereworth is not sufficient to enable the expansion of housing proposed in these areas, which traffic circulation is already under extreme stress. There is also inadequate schooling and services to sustain the sort of increase in housing proposed in these rural areas. The expansion beyond green belt areas will lead to the loss of agriculture in the area as farms will be tempted to sell off for residential development at a time of increased need for agriculture. All in all any development should be limited to the more suitable urban areas where infrastructure in place is better able to cater the onslaught on services of increased housing.

Extending existing urban settlements makes sense as more housing is always expected. Urban areas have the appropriate infrastructure in place which can much more easily be extended if needs be. Same with transport links.

Rural spaces should be left as rural spaces - they are precious and a vital part of a balanced environment. Most rural spaces do not have the infrastructure to support a new community.

Extending urban areas would have less overall impact on the character of the borough and the environment and would cost significantly less.

All other options involve to some degree the effective merger of current distinct villages into larger villages or urban areas. In addition, one reason the Kent Downs are an AONB involve the views from, as well as those of, the AONB of the surrounding area. Major development of this area would have a doubly deleterious effect - notwithstanding the breaching of the Green Belt.

No Response

I think that the green belt and areas of natural beauty are there to be enjoyed by all. People living in Urban areas want to be able to enjoy unspoilt, open, green countryside and not leave one urban area for another. I have lived in other countries and the UK green belt and designated AONB is an uplifting treasure not found anywhere else in the world.

---

**User Response: Text**

I feel that any developments should only be made where there is sufficient infrastructure to satisfy the needs of the added population.

No option addresses climate change; the presumption that Borough Green is an RSC is erroneous; Option 1 is the least worst. The report at 5.3.33 suggests that it has already been concluded that Option 4 is the way forward (assuming assessed needs are to be met), on which basis the answers to this question are irrelevant.

I strongly disagree with developing on green field areas around larger towns eg To bridge Hildenborough /  
i support smart use of Brownsite redevelopment in such towns or eg remodelling office buildings To apartment living for entry buyers

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Urban needs should be met so far as possible from development of brownfield sites. Developers no doubt prefer greenfield and PLD sites for reasons of cost and convenience but they tend to impose higher infrastructural costs.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate and energy are pressing needs. Densifying existing urban settlement is generally seen by most commentators as the most resource efficient solution. The spectrum of land that runs from the green belt through to AONB is also a precious resource, esp for those in dense urban areas for reasons of well being and mental health. Such land should be protected and not degraded

The areas which already have a large scale of development also have the infrastructure to support it. If you develop the more rural areas, they will need the infrastructure to be carefully planned, and implemented and this will cost a lot more than using the existing ones, especially if you are looking at areas that are prone to flooding.

In addition it has been often proven that the developers say they will provide all the requirements such as improved drainage but end up only focusing on what makes them money, the residential side of things. Its all well and good to drain the buildings you have created well but then adding them into an already stretched system which floods cannot work.

How can rural areas that have not got a doctors, dentist, or decent transport connections (for non drivers) be a justified development area? In addition schools would need to increase capacity, many rural village schools have nowhere to expand to, or sufficient funding, they would need to expand at the same time as any development. Not just schools but medical facilities are already overstretched at local health centres and hospitals. We have lost our local police station in Paddock Wood and now rely on Tonbridge, any "non urgent" reports made to 101 can take weeks to be dealt with as they are focussed on the emergencies, more people living in the outlying areas would need support.

The foul drainage systems are old and unable to cope in the existing residential areas in rural parts. In the more rural areas many places that have been identified as development areas are on what is currently arable land, much of this is sited higher than the roads that cut through it and as a result the run off during heavy rainfall leads to widespread flash flooding which would be ascerbated if these areas were built on as concrete and tarmac has even less chance of absorbing water.

I would want all agencies to be consulted and heard, GP's, NHS (Pembury Hospital) Highways Agency, Police, fire, water & drainage suppliers, and the environment agency all need to have their say.

Does not destroy the Green Belt and keeps our local community together.

Greenbelt spaces are not set up for increases in traffic or water use and supplies.

Wateringbury as a conservation area applies planning restrictions which affect current residents and should not be overridden just because local land owners want to make money by building there. Other places are more appropriate choices where infrastructure already exists

Protection of green belt land is paramount, not limited to the benefits of maintaining current agricultural levels to ensure food security in a post Brexit UK, ensuring biodiversity is at least maintained, and general protection of green spaces for people to enjoy recreationally. Sites outside of greenbelt and AONB, i.e. existing urban areas and brownfield site should be expanded upon first.

---

**User Response: Text**

Option 1 is the best of a bad lot. Ideally any further housing development, if needed, should be strictly confined to existing urban areas - if necessary by redevelopment of currently wasted land and reallocation of shops and offices. Urban sprawl outside of the current confines of these areas should be prevented.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality; it is there to prevent urban sprawl and should be respected by this Local Plan.

Development should be focused around the most sustainable settlements: i.e. 'Urban Areas' as defined in the Settlement Hierarchy (Figure 2), such as Kings Hill. Therefore, Option 2 should be the primary spatial strategy adopted; especially so given it scores highly in the 'Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report' (Aug 2022).

Focusing delivery in and around 'Urban Areas' would promote the most sustainable patterns of development when considering existing community infrastructure (especially where there is the potential to enhance provision), transport connections, and centres of employment. The identified 'Urban Areas' are also well distributed when considering the two 'housing market areas' which split the Borough east and west (as identified in the 'Housing Market Delivery Study' (2022)).

Notwithstanding, Option 3 and to a lesser degree Option 4 would also promote sustainable patterns of development and could support the delivery of homes (both market and affordable) in more rural communities across the Borough. Albeit there would still need to be a focus on delivering in and around the defined 'Urban Areas' in both scenarios to meet housing needs sustainably.

Option 5 could also be a good potential spatial strategy if there are realistic options for a new settlement(s). However, new settlements – which can be successful in delivering new infrastructure – are associated with long lead in times. Any gap between the plan being adopted and a new settlement delivering homes would need to be met by deliverable and developable sites elsewhere in Borough before said new settlements came on stream. These sites should primarily be sourced around existing Urban Areas to deliver the most sustainable patterns of development in the meantime.

Option 1 would result in imbalanced delivery across the Borough. It would not provide any housing for the Sevenoaks 'Housing Market Area' to the west of the Borough (where there is severe housing pressure) and limits the sustainable development options around key Urban Areas such as Tonbridge and Kings Hill. There is also



---

**User Response: Text**

unlikely to be sufficient deliverable and developable land to meet the areas defined housing needs in such a focused area within this plan-period.

We must protect Greenfield and Areas of natural beauty to preserve what little is left of the countryside, wildlife and country heritage

Greenbelt and rural settlements/areas were defined as such to protect the English countryside from over development, to protect nature, the environment and retain the character of the rural areas we have left. These areas are important for both people, agriculture and wildlife and it is wrong to redefine them as building plots to meet government targets which seem to be excessive in the county of Kent as a whole. Once you start selecting these areas for building, whether its for housing or commercial, there will be no stopping it and we will lose the beautiful areas which makes TMBC area a green and pleasant place to live. We also do not have the infrastructure, be it roads that can cope with an increase in traffic, doctors, schools etc to cope with the number of units TMBC is being asked to build. Neighbouring borough councils have built many large developments right alongside our own, with their traffic movements for school and work crossing over our borough's roads and it cannot cope. Commuting is taking longer year after year for what is relatively minor journeys. Adding to this flow of traffic, in areas where roads cannot be improved due to the rural and village nature of much of the borough will only make it worse. I cannot see how adding houses in these Greenbelt/Rural areas which cannot cope with any increase will give any kind of improvement to the area.

The amount of houses required will put enormous pressure on the the transport network - especially roads. By developing close to the urban areas, there is already networks in place and infrastructure will be more easy to upgrade (schools etc).

The A227 is a particular concern due to the second Thames crossing already identifying this as a problem.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

transport and other infrastructure already overloaded in most areas so do not agree with widespread development which will basically spread the misery of overdevelopment, destroy green belt and the essential character of the area

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in

---

**User Response: Text**

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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

Stansted Parish Council favour Spatial Strategy Option 2

The areas identified already have good infrastructure that can be further developed and improved. Snodland, Walderslade and the Medway Gap are already well served by the A228 and M2, and by High Speed Rail. Tonbridge is well served by the recently improved A21 and already has excellent rail connections. The existing schools, medical facilities, shops and employment opportunities could be expanded and developed to meet future requirements.

The A20 and A227 are already significantly burdened by heavy traffic and it is important to protect them and the areas they serve from further congestion and over-use with resulting pollution. The A227 is already threatened by potential heavy traffic from the proposed new Lower Thames Crossing.

Without looking at each of the 5 spatial options in very fine detail, which is not presented within the Draft Plan, it is not possible to establish which of the proposed settlements will directly or indirectly impacts on statutory and non-statutory designated wildlife sites and protected and priority habitats. It is recommended that the Option Maps are overlaid with environmental designations/constraints, also accounting for the existing Biodiversity Opportunity Areas – which are likely to form a fundamental part of the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy – to establish which options represent the best outcomes for biodiversity and the climate.

Brownfield sites are typically preferable for development as where these comprise significant areas of hard standing on existing infrastructure it is expected that their biodiversity value is lower than a green field site. The distinction between these brownfield sites, and wildlife rich brownfield sites which support areas of 'Open Mosaic Habitat on Previously Development Land (OMHPDL)' priority habitat should be clearly set out within the plan.

Outside of Green Belt and AONB which must be protected at all costs.

Greenbelt is what it says it is and, unless there are no other options then it should stay that way. Why would you build in an AONB if there are options not to?.

All others allow the encroachment on to green belt.

Less Green Belt encroachment & Borough Green would be swamped. Also no infrastructure to support a huge development

---

**User Response: Text**

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historical towns.
5. assist urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

See previous comments.

Next preference would be 1.

In any event if any further development is to take place in Tonbridge, a solution in some form of north and eastern side ring road needs to be found or the entire town will gridlock.

I am in favour of Option 5 as:

- Kings Hill does not have the infrastructure to support current existing level of development, never mind as a node for further development - this includes doctor surgery capacity, road infrastructure, rail links, street parking etc
- There was brownfield land in the green belt that was assigned for development in the previous (withdrawn) local plan, and that must be reconsidered in order to have an equitable development distribution rather than proposing 6000 new dwellings for Kings Hill!

There should be a focus on redeveloping brownfield sites and reviewing the currently unoccupied dwellings rather the more development. According to government statistics birth rates are dropping and the percentage of housing being built is more than required.

That places like Borough Green with the amount of houses should be moved to an urban area that is able to developed further. This part keeps arguing that it is other rural settlements which should not be the case.

Wrotham could be argued as a Rural service area working alongside Borough Green.

It would not be hard to see areas such as Medway Gap in crouching Eccles and surrounding villages

---

## User Response: Text

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

We support Option 3 because it allows for growth to be dispersed to the most sustainable (Tier 1 and Tier 2) settlements and allows for development in Hadlow, one of the four largest settlements outside of the urban area.

Hadlow, despite its existing status as a rural service centre, has seen limited growth through the last plan period and neither options 1 nor 2 would allow for further growth in this location. Options 1 and 2 are therefore not supported as without growth in Hadlow, the community would decline with young people unable to buy a home due to the lack of affordable housing, and a lack of development would also lead to a lack of investment and spending within the centre. Options 1 and 2 do not accord with the objective of Paragraph 79 of the Framework.

Option 3 allows for growth both in the urban area and in rural service settlements such as Hadlow and is considered to be consistent with the Framework. We therefore support Option 3.

Whilst Option 3 would necessitate the release of land within the Green Belt, the Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment Exceptional Circumstances (Strategic) Note (July 2022) recognises that House prices in the Borough make it difficult for residents to purchase property at Table 3.2. This, TMBC's own commissioned data, indicates that, in TMBC, the median property in 2021 (£375,500) costs 13.4 times the median income (£28,050). This affordability ratio is worse than that for Kent<sup>[1]</sup>, the entirety of SE England<sup>[2]</sup>, and England as a whole<sup>[3]</sup>. This means there is a high barrier of entry for first time buyers hoping to get on the property ladder compared to other authorities. The Borough has a high and worsening housing affordability ratio and so year on year the Borough has exceeded both national and regional house price averages, demonstrating that the Borough is less affordable than England and Southeast England.

The Borough is a desirable place to live with a strong housing market that is overheated according to the HMDS – this means that demand outstrips supply. Hadlow is no exception to this where demand often exceeds supply and there is a lack of affordable family housing on the market. The demand for housing is high and growing in Hadlow and the wider Borough. The undersupply of housing appears to be worsening. The Council should therefore be looking to significantly boost supply through Local Plan 2040.

We note that Table 2 of the HMDS estimates the split of housing need between the Maidstone HMA (Housing Market Area) and the Sevenoaks / Tonbridge / Tunbridge Wells (S/T/TW) HMA. Hadlow falls within the S/T/TW HMA and the estimated need in this area is 361dpa (43% of the overall minimum need of 839dpa). The principle of this does not seem to be covered by any Reg 18 question however we note that the preamble to Q4 on page 22 of the Reg 18 document does refer to the housing market area. Without a clear indication of the preferred strategy, and the preferred approach to allocations, it is difficult at this state to make any meaningful comment as to whether this split is suitable to deliver sustainable balanced communities and meet the plan objectives.

We do also note that the HMDS recognises at Para 5.43 that the 5 year HLS and completed sites compound annual growth rate for the S/T/TW HMA is 0.71% and 0.66% respectively. This indicates that, over this period, the 5YHLS trajectory is unlikely to be achievable. Further site allocations are therefore needed to significantly

---

### User Response: Text

boost the supply of new homes in line with the Framework.

We agree with the Green Belt Assessment Exceptional Circumstances (Strategic) Note that the tightly drawn Green Belt boundaries minimise the potential for settlements such as Hadlow, to accommodate growth without alterations to the existing Green Belt boundaries. We agree this is an important factor in the exceptional circumstances case. We also agree that the constrained nature of the land and the high housing need supports the case that exceptional circumstances exist to justify Green Belt boundary alterations.

We agree therefore that Local Plan 2040 has a good strategic exceptional circumstances case for altering the Green Belt boundaries to help meet the assessed development needs.

The evidence base made available as part of this Regulation 18 consultation therefore clearly supports Option 3 as the way forward. Development in Hadlow should therefore be supported through allocations and release of land from the Green Belt within Hadlow including the land at Maidstone Road (Site ref 59842) which is ideally situated to meet the objectives of the plan.

[1] Where the median property is 11.16 times the median salary

[2] Where the median property is 11.12 times the median salary

[3] Where the median property is 9.05 times the median salary

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality.

Additional development in areas already prone to flooding (mainly from surface water due to inadequate and poorly maintained drains) will only increase the flood risk - both to existing and new developments.

The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

It is an environmental crime to build in areas of beautiful countryside. You will be destroying diversity in nature and homes for thousands of animals and birds. We have in the field behind us bats, owls, rabbits, birds of prey, and many other important species. There are also crops. What will be left to eat if all we have is houses.

---

**User Response: Text**

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

We welcome the objective to encourage the re-use and redevelopment of previously-developed land. Such redevelopment should seek to preserve existing mature trees and protect existing habitats on biodiverse brownfield sites. High density housing should seek to accommodate trees along boundaries, paths and in areas of public space.

I moved from London to the beautiful Kent countryside to enjoy the space and greenbelt for wonderful walks and to be able to breathe fresh air. I accept there needs to be development but there is enough space around the current towns such as Tonbridge, Malling and Kings Hill without needing to build on any of the greenbelt land. I also hope the numbers are very much reduced as this is rather a large number of properties required in such a small area of Kent and the UK.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging. 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Development with Option 2 :

1. Allows expansion for additional housing but utilises the existing services and infrastructure in all forms . If the expansion of housing requirements exceeds these , it is still more economic to expand the existing than create new. Any new facilities that are created will provide maximum advantage and utilisation for the community within , therefore allowing the Borough to make higher levels of investments in better facilities. .

2. It reduces travel as the infrastructure is accessible locally and therefore reduces the environmental footprint. Pollution is limited.

3. It is more cost effective in the development and future management for the Borough and its residents

---

## User Response: Text

4. It avoids or limits impact on the continual pressure to erode the green belt

5. The Green Belt and the rural landscape is a valuable asset of the people that needs to be respected as it cannot be regenerated for future generations once lost . The current generation are custodians .

6. New Development in completely rural or extensively rural outlying areas, such as proposed in options 4 and 5 cannot avoid major destruction of Heritage , Ecology of local habits and the existing biodiversity . The wildlife , Flora and Fauna and their ecosystems centered in such areas are already pressurised by many global influences therefore must be protected and nurtured at a more local level.

7. The communities within the area are still able to enjoy the existence of local rural areas that have been retained and nurtured to be available for their enjoyment through networks of footpaths enabling them to experience the physical and mental health benefits .

Option 4 will allow the distribution of housing growth across the Borough that will also disperse the effects of development, rather than focus this predominantly on a single area – which could ultimately lead to negative impacts such as traffic congestion, noise and air pollution and stretched community resources/infrastructure – for example.

Such an approach will also ensure the spatial strategy accords with paragraph 68 of the NPPF in allocating “a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability”. Subsequently, this will provide the basis for the Council to deliver a robust 5YHLS by allocating specific and deliverable sites and in respect of the release of the Site from the Green Belt, will accord with the NPPF at paragraph 79, in that, it will provide “opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.”

It should be the case that if there is space for development to adjoin or extend from existing, larger settlements, then those should be considered in the first instance. This is due to more developed infrastructure and transport links already being present, and a reduced chance of adverse impact on environmentally and policy constrained land. It would also assist in preserving the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

In addition, there are limited transport links or room for significant expansion of infrastructure to support development in rural areas of the borough, without significant adverse impacts on biodiversity, landscape character, air quality, cultural heritage, and openness of the Green Belt – as the sustainability appraisal makes clear.

The sustainability appraisal further supports the economic case for spatial options 2 and 3, and lesser negative impacts on significant areas of environmental concern.

In West Peckham, which has been used as a main location for 'The Larkins' on ITV for the last two summers, as well as in surrounding villages - the nature of the area is an important draw for visitors, benefiting rural businesses offering boutique accommodation or retreats in the countryside close to London, or even just for day trippers visiting local pubs or even vineyards. The tourism economy (and its potential for growth in future) is reliant on the special nature of the area to attract people to visit.

Development should not be permitted in Rural Areas (option 5) – this would cause significant harm to the countryside, and on people’s health and wellbeing who currently reside in these areas, which are widely used for

---

**User Response: Text**

leisure and recreation. In addition, building on grade 1 agricultural land would harm the rural economy.

I have not chosen a particular strategy option for the following reasons:

1. I have been unwell and have not had sufficient time to properly review the Options that you outline.
2. I do not believe that the Council is looking deeply and radically enough at the opportunities within Tonbridge Town Centre and particularly redeveloping existing commercial buildings and making the most of the abundance of airspace that is ready and waiting to be utilised. In my view that should be properly tested first because it is fully in accordance with NPPF policies, can be set within a vision that looks at least 30 years ahead and is a potential game changer on many fronts including making effective use of land, achieving appropriate densities, rejuvenating the town centre, adopting modern working practices, promoting sustainable transport, minimising reliance on the motor car and protecting the maximum amount of Green Belt Land.
3. I know from experience that there are likely to be strong elements that could be adopted from all 5 options and so the best way forward could well be a permutation that you haven't even considered yet.

Green belt land must be preserved especially if it is valuable agricultural land

there is land available within the Borough which sits outside the Greenbelt and AONB which can meet the needs of the request for building developments. Furthermore this land is closeby local amenities and schools

The road infrastructure the main issue with over developing current sites. We are decades away from living without vehicles and by over developing current sites we damage the environment and feel of current living.

We are blessed today with green belt, AONB, SSSI etc. We need to protect these special designations for future generations. A high proportion of the Borough is greenbelt and I believe Option 1 helps to preserve the biodiversity and green spaces so valued by many residents - humans, animals and plants alike! We need to be guardians of the countryside - now more than ever with mounting concerns about climate change and sustainability. In addition, nature and open spaces are so important for the wellbeing and mental health of human beings. If we can preserve what we have, people living in more densely populated areas of the borough (and outside the borough) can come and enjoy the greenbelt. It doesn't just benefit the people living immediately within green belt/AONB. Preserving the countryside benefits visitors too.

We need to develop areas that have the infrastructure already in place. Many rural areas have not. The East bank of the river has to rely on services out of our area, & it is at breaking point. Lives are being affected.

To be clear I do not agree there should be any building in Tonbridge and Malling. However, if there is to be any then it should be concentrated around urban areas, with the exception of Kings Hill which is a housing development in a rural area. Under no circumstances should green belt land be used. With both a climate and food



---

**User Response: Text**

crisis looming, land should be preserved, re-wilded or used to grow food.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years.

A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Additionally, concentrating development in smaller parts of the borough puts a disproportionate health risk from construction on those areas. Breathing in all the construction dust for many more years to come has got to have a detrimental effect on our lungs. HSE <https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/cis36.pdf> .. The opening paragraph on their page relating to dust construction: "Construction dust is not just a nuisance; it can seriously damage your health and some types can eventually even kill. Regularly breathing these dusts over a long time can therefore cause life-changing lung diseases"

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field areas which I do not support.

The most sustainable locations for growth are those that have good access to services and facilities. A mix within the strategy will ensure a wide range of sites, both in terms of size and location, delivered to support a vibrant and diverse housing market. There are substantial advantages in identifying strategic development opportunities, especially those (like Broadwater Farm **site ID: 59740**) that can make an early contribution to housing land supply (in a location where growth is needed). Pragmatically, this location can accommodate growth, and development on the fringes of Kings Hill would be consistent with the successful spatial policy approach previously established. There is no need for emerging strategic options to ‘reinvent the wheel’ – in fact, to do so, would seriously delay and complicate the delivery of housing, employment, and infrastructure. This last point militates against option 5.

Hereunder, each option is considered in some more detail.

***Strategy Option 1: Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty***

This option follows the provisions of the Framework at chapters 13 and 15, whereby in the first instance development should be focused away from the Green Belt and nationally important areas like AONB. This approach would see greater levels of development being focussed in locations like Broadwater Farm (**site ID: 59740**) but it would be somewhat imbalanced in terms of distribution of growth across the wider Borough including in relation to Housing Market Areas. It would not facilitate development in some sustainable locations such as the Rural Service Centres and its very limited approach would mean the Borough’s housing needs are less likely to be met.

---

**User Response: Text**

***Strategy Option 2 - Urban: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as previously-development land) as well as adjacent to urban settlements***

This option provides for a strong opportunity to deliver significant development at sustainable locations like Broadwater Farm (**site ID: 59740**). Urban extensions are a well-recognised way of delivering development at scale that is close to existing services and facilities, but which can also provide additional facilities and infrastructure to compliment what is available in urban areas (as is referenced in the Framework at paragraph 73). It would however limit development in some sustainable locations such as the Rural Service Centres.

***Strategy Option 3 - Urban and Rural Service Centres: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas and rural service centre settlements.***

It is likely that this option strikes a better balance between supporting the urban, and rural, communities of the Borough as well as across the two Housing Market Areas. There remains a significant opportunity in this option to deliver development at locations like Broadwater Farm (**site ID: 59740**).

Supporting some development at settlements further down the settlement hierarchy allows for a balanced housing distribution and for development to aid in sustaining rural services and facilities. Therefore Option 3 is Berkeley's preferred option.

***Strategy Option 4 - Distributed: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements to support a range of communities.***

Option 4 includes more potential locations for development in rural areas and at smaller settlements. However, the ethos of supporting communities - both rural and urban - across the Borough is similar to option 3. Again, there remains a significant opportunity in this option to deliver development at locations like Broadwater Farm (**site ID: 59740**) and at Rural Service Centres. Therefore, Berkeley also supports Option 4.

The most important factor which will dictate whether this option is pursued is likely to be the overall scale of need for development, and adjustments to the ultimate development requirements, which are considered later in these representations.

***Strategy Option 5 - New Settlement: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, as well as a new settlement/s.***

Berkeley does not support this option, which would bring with it significant hurdles in terms of delivery and the provision in a timely manner of the necessary built and social infrastructure. It appears there is no obvious location for a new settlement that would be well served by public transport and as such the approach is likely to be less sustainable than the other options, particularly Option 3.

Don't waste the nature

don't ruin the forest or cut trees down

My preferred options would be Strategy Option 1 or Strategy Option 5. Option 1 as we need to protect the green environment and it is the one option that seems to have this focus. The reason for mentioning Option 5 is that I

---

**User Response: Text**

think there should be development allowed on a proportionate scale in the existing settlements and, if possible, a new development such as that at Kings Hill.

I believe that there should be a distribution of additional housing through the whole borough

Green belt needs to be extended in East Malling as per original proposal

In terms of local plots the proposed plots 59752, 59802, 59797, 59800 would all destroy areas of outstanding natural beauty, ancient woodland and their local natural habitat.  
They will also absorb Wateringbury, as an other rural settlement into Kings Hill, an urban area, disrupting the settlement hierarchy principle.  
Wateringbury, and in particular Canon Lane, will be hugely impacted by this in terms of traffic/water table issues where we saw a water drought this Summer without this major impact, so in effect this is a anti climate change measure which at first sight is not sustainable. In addition the lane is in effect single track.  
Note in particular site 59802 comprises well managed vineyards and, until recently, productive agricultural fields which have been set aside for reasons which are unclear.

Protecting the green belt should be the highest priority for this and future generations.

Protecting green belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are paramount.

To protect the greenbelt and AONB

Wish to retain green belt and protect ANOB

This is the only Option that maintains Green Belt and AONB.

In the other options you are increasing development in areas that are already very built up and are already lacking in green spaces.

Making existing settlements larger is the lazy option. It strains resources, devalues existing property and dilutes what attracted existing residents to those areas in the first place. If this is supposed to be a 'vision' for 2040, then think bigger than creating new build estates on the edge of existing settlements.

---

**User Response: Text**

To avoid over-development in the Borough, bearing in mind that most of it is Green Belt with major constraints. And to avoid additional pressure on infrastructure - particularly the increased pressure on roads that are already congested, but also pressure on schools and medical facilities

1. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond Green Belt boundaries will add to the congestion and deterioration of quality of life for residents.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions. This is liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

i agree with TMBC that the figures for population increase and housing targets are too high, and it seems unlikely that the existing infrastructure (roads, schools, GP surgery in Hildenborough) will be able to expand to meet demand within the planning timeframe. Open spaces are enjoyed by local people for walking and exercise and this has noticeably increased following the COVID epidemic. Fields in the Green Belt are home to a variety of birds and animals, such as deer, barn owls, buzzards and other birds of prey. Greenfields also slow up the flow of surface water and reduce the risk of flooding

In selecting option 5 this is only on the basis that say one specific new concentrated settlement is built as a garden village with new facilities and infrastructure rather than sprawling adhoc development across the green belt. This is in addition to development focused on existing settlements. In all cases a holistic view for new transport (road, rail, bus, cycling and walking), education (pre-school, primary and secondary), medical (GPs, dentists, and hospital), infrastructure (waste, water, digital) etc facilities for a new concentrated area or expansion of existing areas must always be considered.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

---

**User Response: Text**

Protect the AONB and focus development in areas where the infrastructure exists or can most effectively be upgraded.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

The MGB around Tonbridge ful ls all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

We should be seeking to concentrate development outside of the greenfield and greenbelt sites.

Preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another by maintaining village boundaries, assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, preserve the setting and special characteristics of historic villages (Mereworth was in the Doomsday book), assist in urban regeneration

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF: Strategy Option 1 - Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Strategy Option 2 - Urban: Development focussed on sites within (greenSeld as well as previously-development land) as well as adjacent to urban settlements. Strategy Option 3 - Urban and Rural Service Centres: Development focussed on sites within (greenSeld as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas and rural service centre settlements. Strategy Option 4 - Distributed: Development focussed on sites within (greenSeld as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and

---

**User Response: Text**

other rural settlements to support a range of communities. Strategy Option 5 - New Settlement: Development focussed on sites within (greenSeld as well as PDL) urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, as well as a new settlement/s. 1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging. 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

Assessed housing need is already met by unused planning permissions.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with the requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. Prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. Prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. Safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

---

**User Response: Text**

Development should not be confined to the existing urban areas as outlined in Options 1 and 2 because it will place far too much of a burden on already overcrowded roads, essential services such as GP and dentistry facilities and on remaining green open spaces in these already overdeveloped areas. While Option 3 is slightly more acceptable it is only Option 4 which facilitates the moderate and overdue growth of settlements in all parts of the Borough alongside some further but less intensive development in the established urban areas. As development will be spread more evenly across the Borough some pressure will be taken off those areas of the Borough especially in the Medway Gap that are currently overstretched. As for the smaller settlements themselves it may allow some affordable or social housing to be constructed in parts of the Borough where there is a dire shortfall of this type of housing. This in turn may encourage younger people and people with more diverse employment skills to these areas. This might also have a beneficial impact on rural schools which can suffer a shortfall of pupils compare to their urban counterparts. Green Belt should be respected but not treated as sacrosanct especially in areas of poor land quality, former brown field sites and settlement edges.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by the local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

---

**User Response: Text**

(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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF: Strategy Option 1 - Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Strategy Option 2 - Urban: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as previously-development land) as well as adjacent to urban settlements. Strategy Option 3 - Urban and Rural Service Centres: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas and rural service centre settlements. Strategy Option 4 - Distributed: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements to support a range of communities. Strategy Option 5 - New Settlement: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, as well as a new settlement/s. on sites within (greenfield as well as previously-development land) as well as adjacent to urban settlements. Strategy Option 3 - Urban and Rural Service Centres: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas and rural service centre settlements. Strategy Option 4 - Distributed: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements to support a range of communities. Strategy Option 5 - New Settlement: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, as well as a new settlement/s. 1. prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. 2. prevent neighbouring towns merging. 3. safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

This area is better suited for development

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and



---

**User Response: Text**

deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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. Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

- To safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in more congestion of roads and services to the detriment of current residents.

A new settlement would hopefully minimise the erosion of the greenbelt areas of outstanding beauty that we all rely on for both human and animal wellbeing (especially since COVID and its impact on mental health as well as physical health).

We should be utilising brownfield sites as a priority.

A new settlement would reduce the impact on the existing infrastructure that is already failing in many many areas for residents of Hildenborough. A new settlement would need adequate infrastructure planned into the development.

The greenbelt land should be protected to prevent the urban sprawl of built up areas and prevent villages and towns merging.

---

### User Response: Text

Tonbridge and Malling Borough is split into two Housing Market Areas (HMAs). A housing market area as defined in the NPPG is the geographical area defined by household demand and preferences for types of housing, reflecting the key functional linkages between places where people live and work.

HMAs are not limited by Borough boundaries but rather by the area in which people want to live and work. In Tonbridge and Malling's case, as an example those residents living in Tonbridge would not be likely to contribute to demand for housing close to the Borough boundary with Maidstone. It is therefore necessary to split housing allocations between the two HMAs to meet housing need requirements (therefore ruling out Option 1).

Housing demand is not solely focused on the urban areas, as such, to solely provide new housing within or adjacent to the existing major urban areas would fail to provide for housing needs in the rural areas of the Borough. By providing a range of sites across the urban areas and larger rural service centres, housing would remain located in the most sustainable locations with good access to shops, services and public transport, whilst balancing the need for housing in the rural communities.

To provide housing in the smaller settlements / other rural settlements where there are limited/no shops, services or public transport would increase reliance on the private car and would therefore undermine the principles of sustainability outlined in the NPPF.

**OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing. Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a re-useable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever.**

Having regard to the identified development needs of the area, the constraints in the borough and the two HMAs, we note that five potential spatial strategy options have been identified. We respond on the merits of each of these below.

#### Option 1

1.2.11 Option 1 seeks to focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, thereby seeking to avoid the need to release of any land from the Green Belt as well as avoiding development within a protected landscape.

1.2.12 For the reasons outlined above we fundamentally object to the notion that Green Belt should not be released. If one looks at the settlement hierarchy, Tonbridge, Kings Hill, Snodland, Borough Green, East Peckham, Hadlow, Hildenborough and West Malling are all tier 1 and 2 settlements that fall within the Green Belt and would see development restricted by the option 1 approach. Similarly, Wateringbury also offers a good quality offer of services and facilities that can be enhanced further with growth.

1.2.13 In respect of national policy, paragraph 140 of the NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries can be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At this time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

1.2.14 We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of

---

## User Response: Text

suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities.

However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed.

1.2.15 Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing or employments need can be an exceptional circumstance to justify a review of your Green Belt boundary. This principle was set out within the Hunston High Court judgment in St Albans.

1.2.16 Case law, (*Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council* [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

‘planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive  
Page 5 of 21

obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent’.

Option 1 spatial diagram

Page 6 of 21

1.2.17 Considering these parameters in turn, the acuteness of the local and economic housing need is clear in the need to deliver 15,941 new homes and 296,260 sq.m (69.8ha) of employment provision in the plan period. Furthermore, the Council’s Green Belt Assessment prepared by Arup also confirms that TMBC does have a good strategic exceptional circumstances case for altering the Green Belt boundaries to help meet the assessed development needs.

1.2.18 Suitable Green Belt sites must not be ruled out based on a blanket strategy.

Option 2

1.2.19 Option 2 has an urban focus on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and land adjacent to these settlements. This seeks to locate development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities.

Option 2 spatial diagram

1.2.20 For reasons outlined above, we support the principle of some growth in these locations and they should be the priority for the greatest level of growth.

However, restrict development to within and adjacent to these settlements and not affording any growth to lower tier villages, such as Watlingbury, to evolve, to improve their own sustainability credentials and to benefit from new

Page 7 of 21

infrastructure that only development can deliver would be contrary to good

---

## User Response: Text

planning principles.

1.2.21 It is also important to stress that many of the major settlements are constrained by designations such as flood risk, Green Belt, AONB and highway constraints.

Whilst these are not absolute, there is also a duty to consider what growth can be accommodated without encroachment on these areas.

Options 3 and 4

1.2.22 Option 3 is focussed on settlements near the top of the settlement hierarchy with development focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within and adjacent to the urban areas and rural service centres.

1.2.23 Option 4 follows a similar principle but also allows for some growth other rural settlements.

Option 3 spatial diagram

1.2.24 Effectively options 3 and 4 follow dispersed growth strategies and allow for most settlements to benefit from some level of growth. In our opinion option 4 provides the greatest scope to deliver the right homes in the right location and to ensure that site selection consider all available opportunities on their own merits. We

Page 8 of 21

consider it would be wrong not to allow some proportionate growth for a settlement of Waterringbury's current status and offer.

Option 4 spatial diagram

Option 5

1.2.25 Option considers the potential for a new settlement/s in the borough with residual development focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements.

1.2.26 Option 5 would result in significant concerns. New settlements by the nature are rarely deliverable in an emerging plan period owing to the extensive work required in respect of the physical planning, obtaining of consents and the delivery of essential infrastructure that needs to be front loaded at the outset. Indeed, a strategy dominated by strategic sites will compromise short to medium-term housing needs of the borough as by their nature they will not deliver at the consistent rate required to sustain a five-year supply nor meet the associated HDT.

1.2.27 It is also important to stress that within the south east many Local Plans have failed or encountered significant difficulties owing to overly ambitious plans for

Page 9 of 21

new settlements . Indeed, the proposed delivery of strategic level (i.e. >1000 unit) schemes in Kent have consistently failed due to a lack of understanding of delivery constraints and cross boundary planning (see examples in Ashford, Canterbury and Dover).

1.2.28 We believe it would be unsound to move towards a new settlement strategy until opportunities around existing settlements have been fully explored and exhausted.

Option 5 spatial diagram

1.2.29 Having regard to the options presented, the greatest benefits are associated to options 2 to 4 and the disbursed growth models, accepting that there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of some Green Belt and AONB sites.

Whilst we support this option in principle, as opposed to a much wider distribution under Option 3, we do feel

---

**User Response: Text**

there are merits of a hybrid option between these, one that recognises the proximity and contribution Hildenborough plays to Tonbridge. Many of the other rural service centres are more remote, and hence more reliant on longer travel journeys for employment and other services and facilities. Hildenborough practically abuts the boroughs Principal Town, which we suggest ought to be factored into settlement hierarchy assessments, as part of a slightly amended Option 2, and as a means to attain a more sustainable distribution of growth.

Rydon prefers a combination of Options 3 and 4

Spatial Strategy Option 3- Urban and Rural Service Centres: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas and rural service centre settlements.

Answer: Berkeley supports Strategy Option 3 as the most suitable strategy option for TMBC, where development would be focused on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and rural service centres, including West Malling. Option 4 is also supported for the same reason. These options allow for a balance between development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities, as well as meeting the needs of a wider range of communities in accessible locations.

Selected Option 1 (as above) and Option 2.

Best use of non greenbelt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of furthering flooding problems. Naturally create more affordable housing in cheaper areas. Towns have better infrastructure with good transport & road links, also better medical facilities and bigger schools.

We are very concerned about the potential impact of the proposed development of Capel by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council. This development would impact on East Peckham and surrounding areas. The roads would not be able to cope with this huge proposed development. Our already at breaking point NHS would not be able to handle another 16,000 families.

Please ensure that all relevant agencies are consulted.

This is not really a spatial option without a proper understanding of the availability and deliverability of sites outside the GB and the AONB. These 2 constraints (GB and AONB) should have been applied by the SA assessment of sites. Only if insufficient sites came through should the strategies 2-5 then be offered. Currently the SA of the 5 options indicates that OPTION 1 scores best overall for a balanced spatial strategy. Our preference is for a spatial strategy that protects the GB and the AONB.

---

**User Response: Text**

The GB study on exceptional circumstances concludes that exceptional circumstances could be applied in T&M. However this means nothing in terms of where the allocations should go without a comprehensive Green Belt study across all the LPAs in the Housing Market Areas (HMA) affecting T&M which identifies areas where GB functions are most and least important. Development of the options and then choice of an option is premature in advance of this study. Please refer to our responses under Q40 and 41.

The AONB is different to the Green Belt. More land in the Borough is outside the AONB than outside the Green Belt. T&MBC will be unable to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify release of land in the AONB which is covered by Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of way Act 2000, i.e. the statutory duty of regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. No allocations should be made in the AONBs

I prefer Option 1, followed by Option 2 for the following reasons :

- Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited
- Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough.
- Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent, and therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough.
- There are existing excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2, which have thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

[Option 1 or 2 selected]

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

---

## User Response: Text

### Q4 Reasons:

These 2 constraints (GB an AONB) should have been applied by the SA assessment of sites. Only if insufficient sites came through should the strategies 2-5 then be offered.

### **Our preference is for a spatial strategy that protects the GB and the AONB.**

The AONB is different to the Green Belt. T&MBC will be unable to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify allocation of land in the AONB which is covered by Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of way Act 2000, i.e. the statutory duty of regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. There is much more land available outside the AONB in the Borough either in or out of the GB. No allocations should be made in the AONB or its setting.

Gladman would prefer Option 4, whereby the growth is spatially distributed across the borough.

Gladman consider that a balanced approach to spatial distribution is preferred, therefore Option 4 is preferred. Areas such as East Malling Village are capable of accommodating growth without requiring the need for Green Belt release and should do so to ensure continued vitality and viability.

Option 1 is unlikely to be able to provide land to meet the housing requirement in full due to the Borough's quantum of Green Belt land and the AONB. Equally, Option 2 provides limited scope for growth by limiting growth to urban settlements.

Options 3 and 4 present balanced approaches and recognise the ability of Rural Service Centres and Other Rural Settlements to offer the opportunity to deliver future residential developments in sustainable locations in close proximity to services, facilities, and public transport connections.

Option 4 presents the most balanced approach and recognises the contributions rural settlements can make to the provision of housing. This approach ensures housing can be delivered where it is needed whilst maintaining the vitality and viability of rural settlements.

Gladman support the balance of greenfield land and previously developed land across all options. This recognises that brownfield land is not suitable to be the sole solution to addressing local housing needs and could potentially present viability issues due to the potential for high costs associated with the redevelopment of brownfield land.

- None of the suggested options reflect the needs of current built communities of the North-East area of the borough
- all options seem to continue with the over expansion of builds within existing built areas – this is not deemed acceptable
- **TMBC encouraged to continue to lobby Government for reduction in allocation**
- **Disproportionate amount of TMBC's new housing has been built in and around West Malling in the last 20 years.**

---

## User Response: Text

- A 2022 report compiled for BAG regarding local housing developments:
- ‘... the increase in housing in the immediate vicinity of West Malling; that is within a 1 mile radius,
- the number of dwellings has increased by 3695.
- Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council covers a 93 square mile area, of which the area surrounding **West Malling (including Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange) accounts for 1% of the geographical space of the borough.** However, **this very small area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new homes**

[Selected options 1 and 2]

Best use of non green belt land will with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy an rent and therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and rise for much of the areas in options one and two. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby. The parish council is concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells borough council in particular the proposed development of Capel on neighbouring areas including E Peckham. The parish council is concerned to ensure that the relevant agencies (Environment Agency Highways Agency and HS utility companies) engage robustly with the local planning consultation process we are also concerned about developers engaging with those agencies meaningfully to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

None of these strategies appears to meet West Malling’s needs.

Spatial Strategy 5 comes closest, but since the boundaries are indicative, it is difficult to say.

WMPC places great importance in the need for protection of our town’s historic importance, and its rural setting. We therefore favour a spatial strategy which ensures separation of WM from Kings Hill, East Malling, Larkfield and Leybourne, and a separation of these villages from one another.

We believe our neighbouring Parish Councils also support this emphasis on separate, rural communities.

Given the need to meet Government Housing targets, we recognise the difficulty in a Borough where so much land lies within areas of special protection. However, we do not wish to see further merging of Maidstone and Malling which would result from the options concentrating development in the north-east of the Borough. Though the concept of a garden community is an attractive one, we have difficulty with supporting it without a chosen location.

The preferred spatial strategy option is: Option 4 Distributed: Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements to support a range of communities.

It is important that services within existing settlements can continue to be supported. This can be underpinned with the provision of additional housing that is delivered in a site specific and locally sensitive manner.



---

## User Response: Text

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seeks to ensure that “a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed...” (Paragraph 60). With this as the backdrop for the aim of delivering a sufficient supply of homes, it is imperative that all demographics of people are catered for. Development cannot be restricted to just areas outside of the Green Belt, or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), as this will not necessarily provide land or a mix of housing that is considered suitable or needed and for all communities.

Paragraph 79 of the NPPF sets out that “housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.” The spatial strategies which seek to avoid development in the rural areas, will not provide a contribution to their vitality or ensure their growth and support. Option 4, which promotes a distributed development approach, will ensure that rural areas are allowed and encouraged to grow and not stagnate.

The land adjacent to Kemsing Road and Borough Green Road, Wrotham (site 59707) is situated in a sustainable location with no physical constraints, is available for development and a residential development at such a location will support and benefit from the services provide from neighbour Borough Green. It is considered that the inclusion of site 59707 as a housing allocation would duly support spatial strategy option 4.

Spatial strategy Option 3 focuses on growth in and adjacent to the settlements near the top of the settlement hierarchy, including Tonbridge. As para 4.2.9 of the R18 Plan states, these are settlements with good access to existing services and facilities that can accommodate further growth in a sustainable way. Option 3 is likely to deliver the highest overall growth at the greatest number, variety, and distribution of sustainable sites. Option 3 attained the most positive scores in the SA which would appear to support our proposition that Option 3 is the most sustainable of the options put forward; the Local Plan should follow the findings of the SA and the evidence base.

Option 1 in focusing development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty effectively directs all growth to the north eastern part of the Borough. It is questionable whether this area could fully meet the Borough’s housing needs as well as how this strategy would address the housing needs of West Kent HMA, which is concentrated around the south western part of the Borough. The SA of the previous Local Plan indicated that this approach would lead to an unsustainable approach to growth. This option is in our unsustainable and should not be supported on any level.

Whilst we strongly support development within the top tier of the settlement hierarchy, such as Tonbridge, the option to only develop in this tier could impact the delivery of homes across the Borough in accordance with the housing needs set out in the HMA. A similar option was tested during the last Local Plan Examination and the SA highlighted that it did not perform best in respect of any of the then SA objectives, and was the only option to register a significant negative effect in relation to three of the then SA objectives, including housing delivery and economic growth.

3

Option 4 involves distributing development across the Borough which would lead to unsustainable growth as not all development would be located within areas with good access to existing services and facilities. As such this approach would lead to increased reliance on the car.

With no potential ‘new settlement’ identified areas of search set out in the R18 Plan, it is not possible to comment on Option 5, other than to highlight the fact that this is an inherently high risk option which as authorities such as Tandridge and Waverly can allude to, is not necessarily the panacea it may appear. TMBC has a history of under delivery and a 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) deficit and need to adopt a housing strategy that delivers a variety of sites in different locations and sizes that will generate

---

**User Response: Text**

a rolling 5YHLS. A new settlement will not do this. Not only will it not provide for early delivery, but it could also actively prejudice the overall 5YHLS if delivery slips below that originally envisaged. We note that spatial Option 5 scored the lowest overall in all bar 1 option.

Much of the increase is due to the high price/earnings ratio, which is primarily associated with the Tonbridge region. The instructions associated with the uplift are that the intention is for brownfield sites in urban areas to be used for the uplift. Thus, the plans are not consistent with the government guidelines. Brownfield sites must be used where available, even if they are in green belt, such as the sand pits around Borough Green, and other areas around Tonbridge. Much has been made of the success in the prevention of the development of brownfield sites in Tonbridge, which is contrary to Government guidelines.

Much of the development over the last few decades has been oriented around extensions to existing towns and villages with limited enhancement of resources within those location. This has resulted in significant pressure on the majority of resources in those towns and villages. This includes primary healthcare, parking, roads (especially rural roads that are include those assigned as quiet lanes There are brownfield sites in green belt areas which should be considered as a priority for such development, in the same way as development of Bluewater shopping centre and the neighbouring housing developments.

The number of required dwellings is more than the resources required to be available in the various habitation centres, and as such, a new habitation centre should be considered.

The continuous development around existing settlements without adequate uplift in infrastructure, such as parking, has meant that additional development would be unsustainable. The concentration, based on avoiding green belt where possible, on the best agricultural area in the borough is inappropriate, and an overall review of approach is critical.

Our interpretation of the TMBC Housing Market Delivery Study is that TMBC has had a higher level of CAGR (Compound Annual Growth Rate) for new builds than most of Kent (approximately 50% higher than the average for the South East). Much of the increase in demand for housing is coming from people moving out of London. The primary purpose of the green belt is to avoid the London sprawl destroying the surrounding countryside, and I consider that this aim is important to maintain.

However, the result, where locations closer to London are being built on because of the shape of the green belt, means that the result is in contradiction to the aims of the Green Belt. Based on the TMBC report, we consider that the high rate of new builds in the borough is encouraging the moves from London to the borough, and this is exacerbating the issue, and neighbouring boroughs should be approached to see whether some of the TMBC housing obligations can be satisfied by them, under the duty to co-operate. Alternatively, use of urban and brown field sites is likely to be less attractive to people moving from London and make such developments more available to the local population, which may go some way to alleviating the high house price / earnings ratio that is meaning that government targets for the borough are much higher than the ONS estimate for increases in housing need.

Spatial Strategy: Option 1

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is built over. There is now pressure on the remaining agricultural land

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain.

The option does not address the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e., relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The

---

## User Response: Text

roads to Maidstone are subject to several Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Kings Hill has one main entrance on Tower View which is private and closes once a year for 24 hours on Christmas Day. Several surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area and must not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

Spatial Strategy: Option 2

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is built over.

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e., relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to several Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Kings Hill has one main entrance on Tower View which is private and closes once a year for 24 hours on Christmas Day. Several surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area and must not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

Spatial Strategy: Option 3

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is potential to be built over

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e., relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to several Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of one of the parties developing the site. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area and must not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

Spatial Strategy: Option 4

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is potential to be built over.

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

---

### User Response: Text

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e., relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to several Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

The continual recent development around village centres has meant that most are already overloaded and struggling and more such development will exacerbate the situation.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of one of the parties developing the site. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area and must not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

Spatial Strategy: Option 5

A new town would become an urban area and would require pre-implementation of infrastructure. It does not seem that TMBC are willing to put in such investment. In addition, much of the land would be more costly for developers to develop and would likely only be accepted if there was no alternative. In addition, the road network should be the primary focus for development to ensure that adequate connectivity to service centres was provided. Likewise, new connectivity for water, gas and electricity would need to be implemented. There was brownfield land in green belt that was assigned in the previous (withdrawn) local plan, and that should be re-considered, even given the constraints identified here.

Much of the increase is due to the high price/earnings ratio, which is primarily associated with the Tonbridge region. The instructions associated with the uplift are that the intention is for brownfield sites in urban areas to be used for the uplift. Thus, the plans are not consistent with the government guidelines. Brownfield sites must be used where available, even if they are in green belt, such as the sand pits around Borough Green, and other areas around Tonbridge. Much has been made of the success in the prevention of the development of brownfield sites in Tonbridge, which is contrary to Government guidelines.

Much of the development over the last few decades has been oriented around extensions to existing towns and villages with limited enhancement of resources within those location. This has resulted in significant pressure on the majority of resources in those towns and villages. This includes primary healthcare, parking, roads (especially rural roads that are include those assigned as quiet lanes

There are brownfield sites in green belt areas which should be considered as a priority for such development, in the same way as development of Bluewater shopping centre and the neighbouring housing developments.

The number of required dwellings is in excess of the resources required to be available in the various habitation centres, and as such, a new habitation centre should be considered.

The continuous development around existing settlements without adequate uplift in infrastructure, such as parking, has meant that additional development would be unsustainable. The concentration, based on avoiding green belt where possible, on the best agricultural area in the borough is inappropriate, and an overall review of

---

### User Response: Text

approach is critical.

Our interpretation of the TMBC Housing Market Delivery Study is that TMBC has had a higher level of CAGR (Compound Annual Growth Rate) for new builds than most of Kent (approximately 50% higher than the average for the South East). Much of the increase in demand for housing is coming from people moving out of London. The primary purpose of the green belt is to avoid the London sprawl destroying the surrounding countryside, and I consider that this aim is important to maintain. However, the result, where locations closer to London are being built on because of the shape of the green belt, means that the result is actually in contradiction to the aims of the Green Belt. Based on the TMBC report, we consider that the high rate of new builds in the borough is actually encouraging the moves from London to the borough, and this is exacerbating the issue, and neighbouring boroughs should be approached to see whether some of the TMBC housing obligations can be satisfied by them, under the duty to co-operate. Alternatively, use of urban and brown field sites is likely to be less attractive to people moving from London and make such developments more available to the local population, which may go some way to alleviating the high house price / earnings ratio that is meaning that government targets for the borough are much higher than the ONS estimate for increases in housing need.

### Spatial Strategy: Option 1

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is built over. There is now pressure on the remaining agricultural land

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain.

The option does not address the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Kings Hill has one main entrance on Tower View which is private and closes once a year for 24 hours on Christmas Day. A number of surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area **and must not be** included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

### Spatial Strategy: Option 2

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is built over.

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because

---

**User Response: Text**

of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Kings Hill has one main entrance on Tower View which is private and closes once a year for 24 hours on Christmas Day. A number of surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area and must not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

**Spatial Strategy: Option 3**

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is potential to be built over

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of one of the parties developing the site. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area and must not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

---

## User Response: Text

### Spatial Strategy: Option 4

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is potential to be built over.

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

The continual recent development around village centres has meant that most are already overloaded and struggling and more such development will exacerbate the situation.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of one of the parties developing the site. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area and must not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

### Spatial Strategy: Option 5

A new town would become an urban area and would require pre-implementation of infrastructure. It does not seem that TMBC are willing to put in such investment. In addition, much of the land would be more costly for developers to develop, and would likely only be accepted if there was no alternative. In addition, the road network should be the primary focus for development to ensure that adequate connectivity to service centres was provided. Likewise, new connectivity for water, gas and electricity would need to be implemented. There was brownfield land in green belt that was assigned in the previous (withdrawn) local plan, and that should be re-considered, even given the constraints identified here.

We consider that Option 3 is the most preferable spatial option which focuses on greenfield and previously developed land within the urban areas and Rural Service Centres, as well as land adjacent to these settlements.  
3.21 We recommend Option 3 is pursued as the spatial strategy option in the new Local Plan.

We consider that Option 3 which focuses on greenfield and previously developed land within urban areas and Rural Service Centres as well as adjacent to settlements, will ensure housing and employment needs can be met in full (in accordance with Para. 61 of the NPPF) and will promote sustainable patterns of growth (in accordance with Para. 11a of the NPPF) within the new Local Plan.

3.23 The Interim Sustainability Appraisal ('SA') also supports this statement, given Option 3 scored as one of the most

---

## User Response: Text

favourable strategy options against the SA criteria.

3.24 We recommend that Option 3 is pursued as the spatial strategy option as part of the new Local Plan for the reasons we set out below.

3.25 Our comments on each option are also set out below.

Preferred Spatial Option - Option 3 – Urban and rural service centre focus on greenfield as well as PDL within and adjacent to settlements

3.26 We recommend Option 3 is the preferred option for the new Local Plan. It is the most sustainable spatial strategy

option and we recommend the new Local Plan focuses new development in and around urban areas and Rural Service Centres. As part of this strategy, new development should be allocated at Hadlow.

3.27 We consider Option 3 should be pursued as the preferred spatial strategy option for the following reasons:

1) Option 3 promotes sustainable development in the Borough

3.28 Option 3 directs development towards Tier 1 (Urban Areas) and Tier 2 (Rural Service Centres) settlements which

have the best range of key services and facilities, and levels of accessibility, therefore promoting sustainable patterns of development.

In accordance with Para.8 of the NPPF, Option 3 would achieve sustainable development against all three objectives (economic, social and environmental objectives).

- Economic Objective - Option 3 would ensure sufficient land of the right types is provided in the right places (i.e. the most sustainable settlements) in order to support growth, innovation and improve productivity.

- Social Objective – Option 3 would support and promote existing strong and vibrant settlements in the Borough. It would enhance already accessible settlements and their services and facilities, and encourage walking and cycling creating sustainable and healthy communities.

- Environmental Objective – Option 3 would protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment through locating development in areas that are least constrained and the most sustainable. The accessibility of services and facilities encouraged through Option 3 would also reduce the reliance on private car journeys, promoting sustainable modes of transport in and around the Borough. This would also help in reducing carbon emissions and mitigating climate change.

3.30 We recommend that Hadlow is one of the most sustainable settlements in the Borough, and the site at Court Lane

Nurseries, Hadlow is the most sustainable site.

2) Option 3 ensures a dispersed pattern of growth

3.31 Option 3 spreads development across 10 settlements (both Urban Areas and Rural Service Centres) in the Borough. This is a dispersed approach to distributing development and therefore ensures a balanced distribution of growth.

3.32 This dispersed and balanced approach is more likely to lead to the achievement of meeting a wider range of housing (and other development needs) in full, because development is focused in the most sustainable and established locations.

3.33 It also means a wider range of types of sites and development proposals will come forward. This will help achieve

local development targets.

3.34 This dispersed and balanced approach therefore contributes towards achieving sustainable patterns of development in accordance with Para.11 of the NPPF.

3) Option 3 ensures a balanced distribution of development across two Housing Market Areas

3.35 Option 3 ensures a balanced level of development is distributed between the two Housing Market Areas ('HMA's').

It identifies settlements across both West Kent and Maidstone HMA's ensuring that development can be delivered



---

## User Response: Text

where it is needed the most.

3.36 This balance is also essential given the Council's Housing Market Delivery Study (2022) states that the Maidstone

HMA will not be able to absorb future housing supply in full independently.

4) Limited opportunity to develop within existing settlement confines

3.37 As outlined in the Urban Capacity Study, only 75 sites in the Borough have been identified as having potential for

redevelopment within existing urban areas and Rural Service Centres, with an overall capacity of 1,946 dwellings.

This is c.2 years of the draft housing requirement (based on 839 dwellings per annum (dpa)) and is not sufficient to

meet the Council's housing and employment needs in the Borough over the Plan period.

3.38 This means that Option 3 should be the Council's preferred option given the lack of available sites for redevelopment within settlement confines alone, sites beyond the settlement boundaries are required to meet identified growth.

3.39 The SA also acknowledges the limited opportunity to develop in urban areas and the need to consider greenfield

development. Para. 4.19 of the SA states that "the Council endeavoured to make best use of previously-developed land in built up areas such as Tonbridge for many years. However, and as a consequence, these types of sites are becoming less common. Therefore, the Council believes that it will need to consider the use of greenfield sites, within and beyond existing built-up areas to meet its objectively assessed need".

3.40 We agree with this view and support Option 3 and expect the new Local Plan to bring forward greenfield / Green

Belt sites to help meet local development needs.

5) Option 3 would require minor alterations to the Green Belt only and EC's exist to do so

3.41 As set out in the new Local Plan, Option 3 involves focusing development at land adjoining existing urban areas

and rural service centres.

Given the Green Belt boundaries are tightly drawn around these settlements, Option 3 would require minor alterations to the Green Belt to fulfil this spatial strategy option.

3.43 We consider Exceptional Circumstances ('EC's') exist at a strategic level to alter Green Belt boundaries to help

meet this assessed development needs. This is also supported by the Council's evidence base, notably the EC's Topic Paper (July 2022) which concludes that EC's exist to amend the Green Belt boundaries.

3.44 We also consider that these alterations to the Green Belt to fulfil Option 3 could only be minor and be tightly drawn

around small extensions to the settlement, rather than releasing large swathes of the Green Belt in unsustainable locations.

3.45 We recommend that a review of the Green Belt boundaries is undertaken, and Court Lane Nurseries is released

from the Green Belt to meet development needs.

6) Option 3 would ensure a wide range of sites

3.46 Option 3 would ensure a wide range of sites are allocated, for example brownfield, greenfield and previously developed land, which can also be delivered across different timescales (for example smaller sites in the short term / first 5 years).

3.47 Through allocating a wide range of sites, this will ensure the Council can avoid using a stepped trajectory and

ensure delivery is consistent throughout the Plan Period. A wide range of sites will also ensure a wide range of

---

## User Response: Text

housing types for example houses, flats, self-build, specialist etc.

3.48 Option 3 through providing a range of sites, also supports the Council's Housing Market Delivery Study (2022)

which identifies that the Borough needs more small to medium sized sites as it encourages a more dispersed strategy.

7) Less or no-reliance on strategic sites to achieve development needs

3.49 Option 3 would ensure a range and mix of sites are provided, and does not rely on larger strategic sites, including

a new settlement to be delivered. We support this approach and consider this is positive given the build out rates of new settlements.

3.50 New settlements can be more challenging to bring forward and can take time to deliver, as demonstrated by other

new settlements across the country and referenced within the Lichfield's Start to Finish Report. This sets out that it

can take between 5 and 8 years for large sites to come forward and delivery rates of sites between 1,500 and 1,999 new homes are between 50 – 200 dpa.

3.51 Whilst we recognise that some of the risks associated with the delivery rates can be addressed through housing

trajectories and placing a higher delivery at the end of the Plan period, we consider this remains high risk, and we suggest it is more reliable to allocate sites that can contribute to the housing target consistently throughout the Plan period.

8) Windfall approach to development covers all settlements

3.52 The proposed approach to small and large windfall sites set out in the new Local Plan allows for development to

take place at all settlements, including lower tier locations. This helps to ensure that new development can come forward across the Borough that is commensurate with the size of each settlement. It also means that site allocations are not necessarily required in all settlements.

Possible Option - Option 4 – Distributed pattern of development across the Borough on both greenfield and previously developed land at all tiers of settlement

3.53 Option 4 proposes to distribute development across the Borough at all settlements within the settlement hierarchy,

on both previously developed land and greenfield.

3.54 Whilst we do not dismiss Option 4 as a spatial strategy option, we still consider Option 3 is the most sustainable

for the reasons we set out above.

3.55 Option 4 and its level of dispersal across the Borough is not required, given the windfall approach within the Council's new Local Plan allows for windfall sites to come forward.

3.56 Option 4 would also lead to excessive Green Belt release and would not have regard to the permanence of Green

Belt alterations in the long term, as it would likely be sporadic and in isolated locations. It would also be more challenging to justify Green Belt release in less sustainable locations, unless significant infrastructure is brought forward alongside this growth.

3.57 We therefore do not consider Option 4 should be pursued as the spatial strategy option for the new Local Plan.

Dismissed Option - Option 1 – Focus in and adjacent to settlements / avoiding Green Belt release

3.58 Option 1 proposes to focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary

and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

---

## User Response: Text

3.59 We do not support Option 1 and it should not be pursued as the spatial strategy for the new Local Plan for the following reasons:

- Option 1 does not promote sustainable patterns of development (in accordance with Para. 11 of the NPPF). Option 1 restricts potential locations for growth to a limited number of settlements only, namely to the northeastern part of the Borough, and it does not consider the Borough as a whole. This is not a sensible or realistic approach to define where growth should be located as all existing settlements will have their own needs.

- Option 1 does not represent a balanced approach towards distribution of development as the settlements identified as the focus of development are mostly located in the north-eastern part of the Borough, which has already seen a significant level of development as part of the existing Core Strategy.

- Option 1 could lead to the coalescence of the settlements in the north-east of the Borough, notably Snodland, The Medway Gap and Kings Hill, if development was to come forward outside of these settlement confines.

- Option 1 reduces the range of sites and type of housing (by limiting options for locations for growth).

- Option 1 does not provide a balanced approach across the two Housing Market Areas ('HMA's'). It would direct development largely within the Maidstone HMA, with little development identified in the West Kent HMA.

This would create an unbalanced and unsustainable distribution of development across the HMA's.

Dismissed Option - Option 2 – Urban area focus at greenfield and previously developed land within urban areas.

3.60 Option 2 proposes to focus development on sites within greenfield as well as previously developed land, as well as

adjacent to the main urban areas of Tonbridge, Kings Hill, Snodland, Medway Gap and Walderslade.

3.61 We do not support Option 2 and it should not be pursued as the spatial strategy for the new Local Plan for the following reasons:

- Option 2 does not promote sustainable patterns of development (in accordance with Para. 11 of the NPPF). Option 2 restricts potential locations for growth to a limited number of settlements only, namely to the northeastern

part of the Borough and it does not consider the Borough as a whole. This is not a sensible or realistic approach to define where growth should be located as all existing settlements will have their own needs.

- Option 2 does not represent a balanced approach towards distribution of development as the settlements identified as the focus of development are mostly located in the north-eastern part of the Borough, which has already seen a significant level of development as part of the existing Core Strategy.

- Option 2 could lead to the coalescence of the settlements in the north-east of the Borough, notably Snodland, The Medway Gap and Kings Hill, if development was to come forward outside of these settlement confines.

- Option 2 reduces the range of sites and type of housing (by limiting options for locations for growth).

- Option 2 does not provide a balanced approach across the two Housing Market Areas ('HMA's'). It would direct development largely within the Maidstone HMA, with little development identified in the West Kent HMA.

This creates an unbalanced and unsustainable distribution of development across both HMA's.

Dismissed Option 5 – Development on sites at urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements, as well as a new settlement

3.62 Option 5 proposes a new settlement in addition to development at urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements.

3.63 We do not support Option 5 and it should not be pursued as the spatial strategy for the new Local Plan for the following reasons:

---

## User Response: Text

- Option 5 includes a new settlement (although the Council have not specified where this new settlement could be). Large sites such as new settlements require significant infrastructure improvements to be implemented prior to the commencement of any works. This can cause significant delays to delivery.

Build out rates for new settlements are often slow and can take between 5 and 8 years to come forward.

- The Housing Market Delivery Study (2022) Table 1 states that annual completion rates are 94 dpa to 107 dpa on large / strategic sites in the Borough / local area. This figure is very low compared to the national average of between 50 dpa and 200 dpa (Lichfield's Start to Finish Report). Such large strategic sites are also more challenging to bring forward, mainly as a result of significant pre-commencement works e.g. infrastructure improvements.

- Reliance on large strategic sites would likely require a stepped housing trajectory. This should be avoided as it can cause delay to housing land supply in the short term.

- Option 5 would likely require large amounts of Green Belt release, including Green Belt release for a new settlement given the area outside the Green Belt (to the north-east of the Borough) has already previously been the focus for new growth as part of the adopted Core Strategy.

- Larger sites may be more impactful to landscape, heritage, highways and drainage, than smaller alterations to the Green Belt, that would likely be required for some of the other spatial strategy options, namely Option 3.

### Summary

3.64 Overall, we recommend that Option 3 is pursued as the spatial strategy for the new Local Plan, with Option 4 as

the second favourable option.

3.65 Options 1, 2 and 5 should not be pursued further as part of the new Local Plan for the reasons we set out above.

3.66 This is also supported by the conclusions of the Council's SA process, as we discussed further in Questions 7 and 8.

Having regard to the identified development needs of the area, the constraints in the borough and the two HMAs, we note that five potential spatial strategy options have been identified. We respond on the merits of each of these below.

### Option 1

Option 1 seeks to focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, thereby seeking to avoid the need to release of any land from the Green Belt as well as avoiding development within a protected landscape.

For the reasons outlined above we fundamentally object to the notion that Green Belt should not be released. If one looks at the settlement hierarchy, Tonbridge, Kings Hill, Snodland, Borough Green, East Peckham, Hadlow, Hildenborough and West Malling are all tier 1 and 2 settlements that fall within the Green Belt and would see development restricted by the option 1 approach. Similarly, the edge of Borough Green also offers a good quality offer of services and facilities that can be enhanced further with growth.

In respect of national policy, paragraph 140 of the NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries can be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At this time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

---

## User Response: Text

We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities. However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed.

Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing or employments need can be an exceptional circumstance to justify a review of your Green Belt boundary. This principle was established in the judgement of *St Albans District Council v Hunston Properties Limited* [2013] EWCA 1161.

Further case law, (*Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council*, *Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council* [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

‘Planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- i. the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important)
- ii. the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development
- iii. (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt
- iv. (the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- v. the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent’.

Considering these parameters in turn, the acuteness of the local and economic housing need is clear in the need to deliver 15,941 new homes and 296,260 sq.m. (69.8ha) of employment provision in the plan period. Furthermore, the Council’s Green Belt Assessment prepared by Arup also confirms that TMBC does have a good strategic exceptional circumstances case for altering the Green Belt boundaries to help meet the assessed development needs.

In respect of the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced, this is to be judged on a site-by-site basis. However, we consider the public benefits of our client’s land would include potential for improving public access to the countryside, better footpath links, and would deliver substantial opportunity for biodiversity net gain via woodland management and enhancement. Furthermore, these benefits will occur on a site accepted as suitable for development by the Borough council on a number of previous occasions.

Given this context, suitable Green Belt sites must not be ruled out based on a blanket strategy.

### Option 2

Option 2 has an urban focus on greenfield and previously developed land within the urban areas and land adjacent to the tier 1 settlements. This strategy seeks to locate development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities.

For reasons outlined above, we support the priority of some growth in these locations. However, restricting development to within and adjacent to these settlements and not affording any growth to lower tier villages to evolve, to improve their own sustainability credentials and to benefit from new infrastructure that only

---

## User Response: Text

development can deliver would be contrary to good planning principles.

It is also important to stress that many of the major settlements are also constrained by designations such as flood risk, Green Belt, AONB and highway constraints and they cannot absorb full development needs in their entirety.

### Options 3 and 4

Option 3 is focussed on settlements near the top of the settlement hierarchy with development focussed on greenfield and previously developed land within and adjacent to the urban areas and rural service centres.

Option 4 follows a similar principle but also allows for some growth other rural settlements.

Effectively options 3 and 4 follow dispersed growth strategies and allow for most settlements to benefit from some level of growth. In our opinion option 4 provides the greatest scope to deliver the right homes in the right location and to ensure that site selection consider all available opportunities on their own merits. We consider it would be wrong not to allow some proportionate growth for a settlement of Ightham's status and offer, particularly given its proximity and relationship with Borough Green.

### Option 5

Option 5 considers the potential for a new settlement/s in the borough with residual development focussed on greenfield and previously developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements.

Option 5 causes significant concern. New settlements by the nature are rarely deliverable in an emerging plan period owing to the extensive work required in respect of the physical planning, obtaining of consents and the delivery of essential infrastructure that needs to be front loaded at the outset. Indeed, a strategy dominated by strategic sites will compromise short to medium-term housing needs of the borough as by their nature they will not deliver at the consistent rate required to sustain a five-year supply nor meet the associated HDT.

It is also important to stress that within the southeast many Local Plans have failed or encountered significant difficulties owing to overly ambitious plans for new settlements. Indeed, the proposed delivery of strategic level (i.e. >1000 unit) schemes in Kent have consistently failed due to a lack of understanding of delivery constraints and cross boundary planning (see examples in Ashford, Canterbury and Dover).

We believe it would be unsound to move towards a new settlement strategy until opportunities around existing settlements have been fully explored and exhausted.

Having regard to the options presented, the greatest benefits are associated to options 2 to 4 and the disbursed growth models, accepting that there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of some Green Belt and AONB sites.

To retain as far as possible the existing rural character of the areas outside the urban settlements and their immediate environs.

21. Option 1 : Trenport supports Option 1, being consistent with national policy and partly taking forward the strategy already enshrined in the existing Development Plan. It will support the continued development of the East Bank Strategy explained above. It will minimise the loss of Green Belt. This is key to a sound local plan as unless the Council can demonstrate through its site allocation process that non-Green Belt alternatives have been

---

## User Response: Text

maximised, there will be no exceptional circumstances case to allow for the release of land from the Green Belt. For the reasons set out above, although this option would lead to development at lower order settlements, if infrastructure is properly planned, a sustainable strategy can be brought forward.

Page | 6

22. Option 2 : Trenport does not support Option 2 as it would result in significant and unjustified erosion of the Green Belt, particularly at Tonbridge. In our submission, Option 2 would be no more sustainable than Option 1 as large scale urban extensions would be required that would require their own social infrastructure to be sustainable. There is no reason why such extensions could not be sustainably accommodated outside of the Green Belt as in Option 1.

23. Option 3 : whilst this option suggests a slightly more dispersed pattern of development it would still result in significant conflicts with Green Belt policy and (in the case of expansion at Borough Green) AONB designations but in a wider range of locations compared to Option 2.

24. Option 4 : suggests a dispersed pattern of development. This would still allow for the continuation of the East Bank Strategy and could allow for a more refined selection of changes to the Green Belt boundary where this is needed. However, it would still result in significant erosion of the Green Belt and potential conflict with AONB designations.

25. Option 5 : Trenport do not consider that a completely new self-contained settlement in an undefined location will be a sound strategy. Deliverability will be a key stumbling block, as will be the cost and intensity of new road, rail and social infrastructure. Moreover, even if a site could be identified that was considered sound, it would not deliver new homes for many years and would only contribute to housing trajectory much later in the Plan period. The Borough needs new homes to be supplied to meet needs throughout the Plan period. It is highlighted that a number of Local Plans that have relied on new settlements, often branded “Garden Communities” have been found unsound on the basis of doubts as to viability, infrastructure and timing of delivery.<sup>2</sup>

26. Overall, Trenport prefers Option 1 albeit some development at other locations at Tonbridge and other settlements in the Green Belt may still be required to meet the overall housing requirement. This would suggest a hybrid of Option 1 and Option 4 may be the most appropriate.

Having regard to the identified development needs of the area, the constraints in the borough and the two HMAs, we note that five potential spatial strategy options have been identified. We respond on the merits of each of these below.

### Option 1

Option 1 seeks to focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, thereby seeking to avoid the need to release of any land from the Green Belt as well as avoiding development within a protected landscape.

[Option 1 spatial diagram]

For the reasons outlined above we fundamentally object to the notion that Green Belt should not be released. If one looks at the settlement hierarchy, Tonbridge, Kings Hill, Snodland, Borough Green, East Peckham, Hadlow, Hildenborough and West Malling are all tier 1 and 2 settlements that fall within the Green Belt and would see development restricted by the option 1 approach. In the case of Kings Hill, development would be artificially restricted to the north side, precluding any consideration of sustainable development opportunities to the south of Kings Hill.

---

## User Response: Text

In respect of national policy, paragraph 140 of the NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries can be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At this time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities.

However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed.

Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing or employment need can be an exceptional circumstance to justify a review of the Green Belt boundary. This principle was set out within the Hunston High Court judgment in St Albans where judge stated:

‘Having identified the full objectively assessed needs figure the decision maker must then consider the impact of the other policies set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt policy is not an outright prohibition on development in the Green Belt. Rather it is a prohibition on inappropriate development in the absence of very special circumstances. It is entirely circular to argue that there are no very special circumstances based on objectively assessed but unfulfilled need that can justify development in the Green Belt by reference to a figure that has been arrived at under a revoked policy which was arrived at taking account of the need to avoid development in the Green Belt.’

Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgment states:

‘planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent’.

Considering these parameters in turn, the acuteness of the local and economic housing need is clear in the need to deliver 15,941 new homes and 296,260 sq.m (69.8ha) of employment provision in the plan period. Furthermore, the Council’s Green Belt Assessment prepared by Arup also confirms that TMBC does have a good strategic exceptional circumstances case for altering the Green Belt boundaries to help meet the assessed development needs.

Suitable Green Belt sites must not be ruled out based on a blanket strategy which would be entirely contradictory to the evidence based on a sound planning strategy.



---

## User Response: Text

### Option 2

Option 2 has an urban focus on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and land adjacent to these settlements. This seeks to locate development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities.

[Option 2 spatial diagram]

For reasons outlined above, we support the principle of growth in these locations and they should be the priority for the greatest level of growth. It is important to stress that many of the major settlements are constrained by designations such as flood risk, Green Belt, AONB and highway constraints. Whilst these are not absolute, there is also a duty to consider what growth can be accommodated without unacceptable encroachment on these areas.

### Option 3

Option 3 is focussed on settlements near the top of the settlement hierarchy with development focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within and adjacent to the urban areas and rural service centres.

[Option 3 spatial diagram]

Option 3 is a more positive strategy to that of options 1 and 2, in that the Rural Service Centres are quite rightly allocated a proportion of growth.

### Option 4

Option 4 follows a similar principle to option 3 but also allows for some growth in other rural settlements. Effectively options 3 and 4 follow dispersed growth strategies and allow for most settlements to benefit from some level of growth.

[Option 4 spatial diagram]

### Option 5

Option considers the potential for a new settlement/s in the borough with residual development focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements.

Option 5 would result in significant concerns, not least given that there is clear conflict with the NPPF's requirement (para 22) for strategies which include new settlements to be set within a vision that looks at least 30 years ahead, to take into account the likely timescale for delivery. This is not the case with this emerging plan which proposes a plan period of just 15 years from intended adoption (2025 to 2040).

New settlements by their nature are rarely deliverable in an emerging plan period owing to the extensive work required in respect of the physical planning, obtaining of consents and the delivery of essential infrastructure that needs to be front loaded at the outset. Indeed, a strategy dominated by strategic sites will compromise short to medium-term housing needs of the borough as by their nature they will not deliver at the consistent rate required to sustain a five-year supply nor meet the associated HDT.

It is also important to stress that within the south east many Local Plans have failed or encountered significant difficulties owing to overly ambitious plans for new settlements. Indeed, the proposed delivery of strategic level

---

## User Response: Text

(i.e. >1000 unit) schemes in Kent have consistently failed due to a lack of understanding of delivery constraints and cross boundary planning (see examples in Ashford, Canterbury and Dover).

We believe it would be unsound to move towards a new settlement strategy until opportunities around existing settlements have been fully explored and exhausted.

[Option 5 spatial diagram]

Having regard to the options presented, the greatest benefits are associated to options 2 to 4 and the disbursed growth models, accepting that there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of some Green Belt sites.

Having regard to the identified development needs of the area, the constraints in the Borough and the two HMAs, five potential spatial strategy options are identified. We respond on the merits of each of these below.

### Option 1

Option 1 seeks to focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the AONB, thereby seeking to avoid the need to release of any land from the Green Belt as well as avoiding development within a protected landscape.

[Option 1 spatial diagram]

For the reasons outlined we fundamentally object to the notion that Green Belt should not be released. If one looks at the settlement hierarchy, Tonbridge, Kings Hill, Snodland, Borough Green, East Peckham, Hadlow, Hildenborough and West Malling are all tier 1 and 2 settlements that fall within the Green Belt and would see development restricted by the Option 1 approach.

In respect of National policy, the NPPF (para 140) states that Green Belt boundaries can be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At this time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities. However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is essential.

Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing or employment need can be an exceptional circumstance to justify a review of the Green Belt boundary. This principle was set out within the Hunston High Court judgment in St Albans where judge stated:

‘Having identified the full objectively assessed needs figure the decision maker must then consider the impact of the other policies set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt policy is not an outright prohibition on development in the Green Belt. Rather it is a prohibition on inappropriate development in the absence of very special circumstances. It is entirely circular to argue that there are no very special circumstances based on objectively assessed but unfulfilled need that can justify development in the Green Belt by reference to a figure that has been arrived at under a revoked policy which was arrived at taking account of the need to avoid development in the Green Belt.’

## User Response: Text

Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgment states:

‘planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent’.

Considering these parameters in turn, the acuteness of the local and economic housing need is clear in the need to deliver 15,941 new homes and 296,260 sq.m (69.8ha) of employment provision in the Plan period. Furthermore, the Council’s Green Belt Assessment prepared by Arup confirms that TMBC does have a good strategic exceptional circumstances case for altering the Green Belt boundaries to help meet the assessed development needs.

Suitable Green Belt sites must not be ruled out based on a blanket strategy which would be entirely contradictory to the evidence based on a sound planning strategy.

### Option 2

Option 2 has an urban focus on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas and land adjacent to these settlements. This seeks to locate development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities.

[Option 2 spatial diagram]

For reasons outlined above, we support the principle of growth in these locations and they should be the priority for the greatest level of growth. It is important to stress that many of the major settlements are constrained by designations such as flood risk, Green Belt, AONB and highway constraints. Whilst these are not absolute, there is also a duty to consider what growth can be accommodated without unacceptable encroachment on these areas.

### Option 3

Option 3 is focussed on settlements near the top of the settlement hierarchy with development focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within and adjacent to the urban areas and rural service centres.

[Option 3 spatial diagram]

Option 3 is a more positive strategy to that of options 1 and 2, in that the Rural Service Centres are quite rightly allocated a proportion of growth.

### Option 4

---

## User Response: Text

Option 4 follows a similar principle to option 3 but also allows for some growth in other rural settlements. Effectively options 3 and 4 follow dispersed growth strategies and allow for most settlements to benefit from some level of growth.

[Option 4 spatial diagram]

### Option 5

Option considers the potential for a new settlement/s in the borough with residual development focussed on greenfield and previously-developed land within the urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements.

Option 5 would result in significant concerns, not least given that there is clear conflict with the NPPF's requirement (para 22) for strategies which include new settlements to be set within a vision that looks at least 30 years ahead, to take into account the likely timescale for delivery. This is not the case with this emerging plan which proposes a plan period of just 15 years from intended adoption (2025 to 2040).

New settlements by their nature are rarely deliverable in an emerging plan period owing to the extensive work required in respect of the physical planning, obtaining of consents and the delivery of essential infrastructure that needs to be front loaded at the outset. Indeed, a strategy dominated by strategic sites will compromise short to medium-term housing needs of the borough as by their nature they will not deliver at the consistent rate required to sustain a five-year supply nor meet the associated HDT.

It is also important to stress that within the south east many Local Plans have failed or encountered significant difficulties owing to overly ambitious plans for new settlements. Indeed, the proposed delivery of strategic level (i.e. >1000 unit) schemes in Kent have consistently failed due to a lack of understanding of delivery constraints and cross boundary planning (see examples in Ashford, Canterbury and Dover).

We believe it would be unsound to move towards a new settlement strategy until opportunities around existing settlements have been fully explored and exhausted.

[Option 5 spatial diagram]

Having regard to the options presented, the greatest benefits are associated to Options 2 to 4 and the disbursed growth models.

We believe **spatial strategy options 3** (focussed on settlements near the top of the settlement hierarchy) is the most appropriate and sustainable spatial strategy. We appreciate that TMBC needs to consult on a range of options, it is not clear of the basis of option 5 (new settlement) without knowledge of what is being promoted. TMBC needs to be mindful that a basket of sites, of varied scales, notably those controlled by housebuilders, should provide the most achievable/ deliverable sites, to maintain a rolling five year housing land supply. New settlements, or major strategic sites do have significant lead in times for delivery.

**Spatial strategy options 3** focuses growth in and adjacent to the settlements near the top of the settlement hierarchy, including Tonbridge and Hadlow. As para 4.2.9 of the Reg 18 Plan states these are settlements with good access to existing services and facilities that can accommodate further growth in a sustainable way. In addition options 3 is likely to be able to deliver the highest overall growth at the greatest number, variety, and distribution of sustainable sites.

---

**User Response: Text**

Option 1 in focusing development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty effectively directs all growth to the north eastern part of the Borough. Not only is it questionable as to whether this area alone could meet the totality of the Boroughs housing needs, but it has to be questioned how this strategy would address the housing needs of West Kent HMA which is concentrated around the south western part of the Borough. Given our involvement in the previous Local Plan Examination we are aware of the fact that the SA of the previous Local Plan indicated that this approach would lead to an unsustainable approach to growth. This option is in our opinion totally unsustainable and cannot/ should not be supported on any level.

Option 2 in concentrating development just within the top tier of the settlement hierarchy potentially prejudices the smaller sustainable settlements, such as Hadlow, and is less well related to the needs of the principle HMA's that fall within the Borough. Again we note that a similar option was tested during the last Local Plan Examination and the SA highlighted the fact that it notably did not perform best in respect of any of the then SA objectives, and was the only option to register a significant negative effect in relation to three of the then SA objectives, including housing delivery and economic growth. Whilst this did not automatically mean that option performed poorly overall (as options were not assigned any weighting), the SA acknowledged that it was a strong indicator.

Option 4 in distributing development across the Borough would we feel lead to an unsustainable approach to growth as not all development would be located within areas with good access to existing services and facilities. As such this approach would lead to increased reliance on the car.

And with no potential 'new settlement' identified / areas of search set out in the Reg 18 Plan, it is not possible to comment on Option 5, other than to highlight the fact that this is an inherently high risk option, which as authorities such as Tandridge and Waverly can allude to, is not necessarily the panacea it may appear. Where, in authorities such as Tonbridge and Malling you have a history of under delivery and a 5 year Housing Land Supply deficit you need to adopt a housing strategy that looks to deliver a variety of different sites in different locations and of different sizes that will generate a rolling 5 year Housing 0 see themselves in a planning by appeal situation which would be to no one's advantage - least of all local residents and service providers.

Whilst we comment further on the Assessment of the Spatial Options in the SA in our response to question 7, we note that spatial option 5 scored the lowest overall in all bar 1 option, and that conversely option 3 attained the most positive scores which would appear to support our proposition that option 3 is the most sustainable of the options put forward.

New housing should be located outside the greenfield and greenbelt sites and not on grade 1 agricultural land. It would also avoid building within a protected landscape.

In our opinion option 4 provides the greatest scope to deliver the right homes in the right location and to ensure that site selection consider all available opportunities on their own merits. We consider it would be wrong not to allow some proportionate growth for a settlement of East Peckham's status and offer, particularly given its relatively strong provision of existing day-to-day services and facilities and its proximity and relationship with Paddock Wood.

Having regard to the options presented, the greatest benefits are associated to options 2 to 4 and the disbursed growth models, accepting that there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of some Green Belt and

---

**User Response: Text**

AONB sites.

We consider that all options set out above are a suitable way forward in defining the spatial strategy with a focus on a combination of Options 4 and 5.

TMBC faces challenges in order to accommodate housing and economic needs over the Plan period, particularly given that the Borough is presently 71% Green Belt. To deliver the level of growth required, it is considered that development should be distributed across the Borough (Option 4) and new settlement option (option 5) should be proposed.

The ability to meet need in both HMAs is key to the Local Plan being found sound. Focus should be on, and adjacent to, the urban areas first. Recognising that there is limited scope for expansion of Tonbridge in the West Kent HMA, opportunities for allocations adjacent at Tonbridge should be taken ((such as the allocation of Goldings Yard, Stocks Green Road)) together with allocations at the next most sustainable settlements: the RSCs. Land at Maidstone Road, Hadlow, represents such a suitable site. Option 4 is the next most preferable. Option 1 is unsound, and Option 5 has significant risks in terms of soundness.

Option 4 will allow the distribution of housing growth across the Borough that will also disperse the effects of development, rather than focus this predominantly on a single area – which could ultimately lead to negative impacts such as traffic congestion, noise and air pollution and stretched community resources/infrastructure – for example.

Such an approach will also ensure the spatial strategy accords with paragraph 68 of the NPPF in allocating “a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability”. Subsequently, this will provide the basis for the Council to deliver a robust 5YHLS by allocating specific and deliverable sites and in respect of the release of the Site from the Green Belt, will accord with the NPPF at paragraph 79, in that, it will provide “opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.”

This option (Option 4) would distribute development across the Borough, providing development at the most sustainable settlements (using PDL and sustainably located greenfield sites as appropriate) whilst also, importantly, having regard to the provision of housing, on PDL and sustainably located greenfield sites, in and adjacent to the Borough’s rural service centres and other rural settlements, thereby providing for local housing needs and supporting local level service provision.

Furthermore, the ‘distributed’ option would ensure that the Local Plan strategy is not overly reliant on large developments that often have delivery limitations and, therefore, ensures a more deliverable strategy overall. Such an approach would also be in accordance with paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”), which states that: “small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly”.

---

## User Response: Text

### Credibility of Options / Reasonable Alternatives

Vistry are concerned that the options presented at Q.3 and its associated text, do not appear to have a strong relationship with the supporting evidence base. Therefore, it is not clear that these options can be comprehensively tested and compared. Our underlying concern is that TMBC intends to progress from this high-level 'Issues and Options' style of consultation, directly to a Regulation 19 'Draft Local Plan', followed by submission for Examination. This approach is likely to preclude proper consideration and testing of the spatial options (and alternatives) that the Plan could pursue.

It is acknowledged that the Interim SA (2022) provides an analysis of the options presented in the Consultation Document. However, the robustness of this assessment is reduced because the options considered are highly conceptual and do not appear sufficiently embedded within supporting evidence. Therefore, in the absence of an intervening consultation (such as a consultation on a 'Preferred Options' document or Regulation 18 'Draft Local Plan'), there will be limited scope to test or refine the options in a manner which is transparent and credible.

For example, the Consultation Document indicates that an option for a new settlement(s) is being considered and explored as a reasonable alternative. Yet, neither the document nor the evidence base identifies the potential areas of search for a new settlement(s). Despite this, we are effectively asked to accept that potential locations for a new settlement(s) could be fully explored, with a final selection subsequently being 'presented' in a Regulation 19 Local Plan without the need for any further testing or consultation prior to submission.

Moreover, this 'hurried' approach may also mean that locations for potential new settlements / urban extensions, are not successfully identified and evaluated. This includes, for example, strategic growth that might be provided in the vicinity of Hildenborough Railway Station, as part of a transport-centric urban expansion / Garden Village (as noted below). Having a full understanding of the opportunities available will be vital in demonstrating that the Plan's policies are fully justified (as a test of soundness).

It is challenging then to accept that all options and reasonable alternatives will be fully and transparently considered. This increases the risk that, during the Examination, the Plan will be found not to comply with the 'Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004', and other relevant legislation. Should a material lack of compliance be demonstrated, then it is possible that the Plan would fail on a matter of legal compliance.

Similarly, if spatial options are considered in a 'cursory' way, it will be more challenging to demonstrate that the Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development, by promoting sustainable patterns of development. This is a fundamental requirement of Plan-making, as set out at Section 39 of the 'Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004', and as further articulated through the NPPF. The Plan could therefore fail the tests of soundness. This is to say nothing of the political challenges that may arise if the consultation process is felt to be deficient.

Notwithstanding our concerns regarding the depth of the evidence base and the apparent intention to 'rush' to a Regulation 19 consultation, Vistry believes that Option 3 is the most suitable option, with Option 5 also meriting consideration. The reasoning behind this is set out in our response to Question 4 below.

### Q.4 Reasons for Selecting this Spatial Strategy Option.

As indicated Vistry consider that Option 3 followed by Option 5, should be preferred. Vistry provides commentary below on each of the spatial strategy options identified in the Consultation Document, as well as the two alternative options identified in the SA at pages 94 to 100.

#### Option 1

---

## User Response: Text

This option seeks to “Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty”.

Vistry recognises that Option 1 would not require the release of Green Belt land. However, the ‘Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment Exceptional Circumstances (Strategic) Note’ (July 2022), which forms part of the evidence base, effectively confirms that a spatial strategy prepared in accordance with this option would result in housing needs failing to be met in full.

On page 12 of the Exceptional Circumstances (Strategic) Note, it is indicated that some 77% of the Borough is constrained by either Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) or national / internationally significant environmental constraints (such as SSSI). Much of the Borough is also constrained by other constraints, such as flood risk.

Moreover, were Option 1 to be progressed, the vast majority of new development would be concentrated in and around a small number of settlements in the east of the Borough. Such a focus would invariably place significant pressure on existing infrastructure. This may increase the complexity of delivering of homes, as new pre-requisite strategic infrastructure has to come forward to mitigate and/or alleviate potential impacts. In turn, this creates a risk to the timely delivery of new homes, potentially rendering the Plan less effective at sustaining the required five-year housing land supply (5YHLS).

The concentration of growth in the east of the Borough would also be inconsistent with the two Housing Market Areas (HMAs) identified in the Housing Market Delivery Study (July 2022). This report confirms that the west of the Borough falls within a ‘Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA’, that experiences distinct patterns of supply and demand when compared to the ‘Maidstone HMA’.

As the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA falls almost entirely within the Green Belt and/or AONBs, there is no option but to meet housing needs within areas of constraint. Indeed, land beyond the Green Belt / AONB (within Tonbridge and Malling Borough) falls within the separate Maidstone HMA. Consequently, new housing has to be directed to west / south-west of the Plan-area, in order to ensure that housing is provided where there is a clear market impetus for delivery and demonstrable need.

Moreover, it is notable that the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA, extends across administrative boundaries to include the towns of Sevenoaks, Tonbridge, Tunbridge Wells and Crowborough. There is then a clear rationale for delivering new homes within this HMA, despite the aforementioned constraints. Indeed, Vistry regard this as essential, noting that the absence of an effective plan for achieving coordinated growth (within this cross-boundary HMA) was the underlying cause of the previously submitted Plan’s failure to address the Duty-to-Cooperate.

A spatial strategy that seeks to wholly avoid areas of constraint (including the Green Belt) would therefore not be effective, justified, nor consistent with national planning policies. Put simply, if the Plan is progressed based on Option 1, it is likely to be judged unsound when subject to Examination.

### Option 2

Option 2 ‘Urban’ would see “Development focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as previously-developed land) as well as adjacent to urban settlements.”

Whilst such an approach would be more justified than Option 1, in that growth would occur in both HMAs identified in the evidence base, Option 2 would nonetheless result in an overconcentration of development at top-tier settlements.



---

## User Response: Text

For the Plan to prove effective at both addressing housing needs in full and maintaining a rolling 5YHLS, it is essential that housing growth is distributed more broadly than envisaged in Option 2, in accordance with the identified settlement hierarchy.

A particular concern is that a singular focus on top-tier settlements is likely to result in excessively concentrated growth. Vistry consider that this approach risks reducing rates of housing delivery, as localised markets are unable to absorb very high levels of supply, within limited geographies.

Likewise, apportioning future growth exclusively to top-tier settlements would fail to spread the benefits of development (such as new affordable housing and community infrastructure) in an equitable way. An over-concentration is also likely to increase the magnitude of required strategic infrastructure and transport-related improvements. This may impact implementation and delay the delivery of new homes, services, and employment.

As such, a strategy focused solely on achieving growth at Urban Areas is unlikely to be effective at meeting housing needs and would therefore be unjustified and inconsistent with national planning policies, which represent fundamental tests of soundness.

### Option 3

This option ('Urban and Rural Service Centres'), suggests that Development will be "focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL), as well as adjacent to, urban areas and rural service centre settlements".

In creating a larger pool of different sized sites, this approach will facilitate the supply of housing and spread the benefits of growth to a wider range of communities, including Hildenborough.

However, it is important that sites which do not directly adjoin existing settlement boundaries are not simply excluded from the detailed site selection process. This is particularly the case where a site is well-related to the services at the settlement and presents other sustainability benefits.

For example, in the case of Hildenborough, Land South of Noble Tree Road lies outside of the settlement boundary. However, it adjoins Hildenborough Railway Station, such that new housing at the site would facilitate low-carbon transport modes. Likewise, the site is connected to the settlement via a pedestrian walkway and is approximately 10 minutes' walk from the main cluster of local services in the village.

Overall, and subject to the proviso specified above, Vistry considers that Option 3 could represent a justified and effective spatial strategy, particularly if the detailed site selection process favours those sites where development has the potential to maximise travel by non-car modes.

### Option 4

Option 4 ('Distributed'), would see development "focussed on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and other rural settlements to support a range of communities".

This option would result in a very broad distribution of growth to settlements across the Plan-area. Whilst this approach has the advantage of spreading the benefits of development to a wide range of communities, it may result in growth at locations which are not accessible, lack services and which have small existing populations.

Should this option be taken forward, most of the future housing growth would still need to be directed to the urban areas and rural service centres. The scale of distribution to villages within the 'other rural settlements' category would need to be comparatively limited overall, with the scale of specific allocations being informed by the circumstances of each settlement.

---

## User Response: Text

### Option 5

This option 'new settlement', considers the potential for a new settlement(s) to be brought forward within the Plan-area "in-principle". Vistry are concerned that the 'broad areas of search' associated with this option (as set out at Figure 7 of the consultation document), appear to deliberately exclude land adjoining or near existing settlements.

The exclusion of areas around existing settlements is not appropriate, as 'new settlements' are rarely brought forward in areas that are entirely free of existing development. Indeed, new settlements are typically proposed at key transport nodes (notably train stations) and/or function as 'urban extensions' to existing towns, even if they are physically separated by design.

For example, many 'garden villages' are described as new settlements, in so far as they promote a degree of self-containment and are master-planned to avoid physical coalescence (through the distribution of open space and green infrastructure). However, such new settlements are often located within close proximity to an established town or village, and exhibit strong functional relationships (through work and travel patterns) with it.

Vistry consider that such a 'garden village' could be provided to the west / south west of Hildenborough, within the area that lies to the north of the railway line and south of Noble Tree Road / Tonbridge Road. This would facilitate connectivity between Hildenborough and Hilden Park, and Hildenborough Railway Station, and would deliver new homes near an important public transport node. This would clearly bring significant sustainability benefits, not least through the facilitation of travel by non-car modes.

Taking this into account, Vistry maintains that the area of search should be both broadened such that land next to existing settlements is not excluded on an arbitrary basis. This will allow for a fuller exploration of how best to promote sustainable patterns of development across the Plan-area. The broad area/location(s) should also be more refined prior to Regulation 19 Stage, noting Vistry's previously cited concerns regarding the limited scope of future Local Plan consultations as proposed.

**Strategy Option 1\_** Should be adopted as this prohibits the loss of the Green Belt and harmful development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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 (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

---

### User Response: Text

- 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 (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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 (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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 (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in extreme congestion and deterioration in the quality of life for the town's inhabitants. This is an extreme likelihood due to the pending nearby developments (Tudeley, Paddock Wood) proposed by Tunbridge Wells B.C. in their current local plan.

My favoured option is **OPTION 1: OUTSIDE** of GREEN BELT and AONB which must be protected at all costs.

Whilst all areas need some development, GREEN BELT was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is sacrosanct.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever

---

### User Response: Text

The overall plan should be seeking to protect areas of high quality green belt (such as open green fields, previously undeveloped greenbelt). There should also be efforts to protect high quality agricultural land in the plan, whether it is in greenbelt or not. Although Option 1 focuses on areas outside the greenbelt, those would be my top 3 priorities:

1. Protect green belt
2. Protect high quality agricultural land
3. Protect previously undeveloped greenfield green belt land

In addition i would like to see an overall strategy that avoids settlements merging and avoiding development outside of the established boundaries of settlements

Greenbelt is vitally important for openness. It doesn't have to be pretty, just open and to prevent urban sprawl.

**I prefer Option 1, followed by Option 2 for the following reasons :**

- **Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited**
- **Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough.**
- **Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent, and therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough.**
- **There are existing excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2, which have thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including Hadlow.**

**I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.**

The proposed land in Hildenborough is over developed, and services stretch to capacity i.e. sewers, landscape drainage, schools, doctors surgeries over subscribed.

Question.5

Which spatial strategy option do you prefer? OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing

Question.6.

What are your reasons for selecting this spatial strategy option? Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a re-useable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever

---

**User Response: Text**

**Greenbelt is and AONB are protected areas for a reason it is not a reusable commodity – there are biodiversity unique environments of nature. At a time where climate change is at the forefront for most countries, UK are getting rid of vast areas of trees and natural habitat to make way for more houses. Green areas are not only good from an ecological viewpoint but also from a mental health viewpoint.**

**Once Greenbelt is gone, it is gone forever, and Greenbelt's main use is openness and to prevent "Coalescence of Settlements" we don't want villages to sprawl into each other, we want them to remain separate and unique villages. If you build on greenbelt, planting shrubs and trees will not replace the biodiverse environment that bugs, insects, animals, reptiles, birds have taken 100s of years to create**

**Option 4** I think that all communities need housing for young families from the locality and see no reason why rural villages should be exempt. There should be a range of housing, including 1 and 2 bed flats and affordable starter homes. Not 5-bed executive housing. The amount of development should be proportionate to the size of the settlement. Option 5 appears to be Borough Green Garden City, which is an option that urbanises the area forming continuous development between Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green and North Ightham.

Option 1- Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer green belt boundary and o/s area of outstanding natural beauty

A check unrestricted sprawl

B prevent neighbourhood neighbouring area towns merging

C safeguard countryside from encroachment

D preserved setting and character of the town

E assist urban regeneration.

Continual expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing green belt will cause congestion and that aeration of the town.

Q3 /Q4 : I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

---

**User Response: Text**

Best use of non green belt land with the least harm to character areas with a limited infrastructure. The lease risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefor will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am very concerned about the potential impact of the local development within the Tunbridge Wells borough council, in particular the proposed development in Capel, on the neighboring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant agencies i.e. environment agency, highway agency, NHS and utility companies, engage robustly with local planning consultation process. I am also concerned about developers engaging with those agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

- None of the options are supported as each assumes expansion of Kings Hill
- Kings Hill should remain within the confines of its airbase brownfield site as per previous plans.
- Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the coalescence of communities.
- As a principal however, I agree that the development of brownfield is preferable to destroying open countryside and valuable farmland.

Best use of brown belt sites. Medway mainly industrial

Green Belt land should be protected to avoid urban sprawl. It is mostly good agricultural land much needed for future food production.

- Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are sacrosanct. The purpose of Green Belt is to protect the countryside and prevent urban sprawl. AONBs should not be subjected to harmful development.

---

### User Response: Text

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

- None of the suggested options reflect the needs of current built communities of the North-East area of the borough
- all options seem to continue with the over expansion of builds within existing built areas – this is not deemed acceptable
- **TMBC encouraged to continue to lobby Government for reduction in allocation**
- **Disproportionate amount of TMBC's new housing has been built in and around West Malling in the last 20 years.**
- A 2022 report compiled for BAG regarding local housing developments:
- ‘... the increase in housing in the immediate vicinity of West Malling; that is within a 1 mile radius,
- the number of dwellings has increased by 3695.
- Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council covers a 93 square mile area, of which the area surrounding **West Malling (including Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange) accounts for 1% of the geographical space of the borough.** However, **this very small area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new homes**

Outside of Green Belt and AONB which must be protected at all costs. Whilst all areas need some development, Green Belt was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is sacrosanct.

It is noted that an Urban Capacity Study (July 2022) has been undertaken to identify sites within existing urban areas and Rural Service Centres that could be utilised for housing needs. The study identifies a range of potential development sites with a theoretical capacity of circa. 2,000 homes which are to be investigated further as part of the Plan-making process. However, we consider that as part of this process it will be essential to robustly establish if these sites are realistically suitable, deliverable and available, particularly as the majority of sites appear to comprise valuable public amenity land or previously developed sites comprise car parks, which from the aerial imagery provided at Appendix E of the Study appear to be well used.

The Study therefore indicates limited opportunities exist within the urban areas and RSCs, much less than the theoretical capacity identified, and we therefore have significant reservations that reservations that Options 1, 2

---

**User Response: Text**

and 3 alone would deliver sufficient land to accommodate the Council's housing needs.

It is therefore considered that a balanced and blended approach to Options 4 and 5 will likely be required to meet the housing needs of the Borough. These Options will best ensure that a wide range of sites, including smaller and larger plots, development adjacent settlements, on green field and on brownfield are delivered, which will assist in providing for a consistent supply of homes across the Plan period.

We note that the Housing Market Delivery Study identifies East Peckham to be located within the Maidstone HMA, albeit limited evidence is provided to establish why this is now within the Maidstone HMA and not the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA. It is unclear whether the emerging Local Plan will seek to provide a distinct housing requirement for each HMA, if this is pursued additional evidence and a robust justification will be needed to demonstrate the suitable locational boundaries between the HMAs in the Borough.

Where there is overlap between the HMAs, which is likely to be the case for East Peckham, these areas should be acknowledged as appropriate locations for housing delivery to serve both HMAs.

Matters relating to HMAs are a cross boundary strategic issue. Changes to HMA boundaries should be discussed and agreed with relevant neighbouring authorities within the same HMA areas (i.e. Maidstone and Sevenoaks).

If only two options then we must go with 'only meeting assessed housing need' - i.e. Option 1. It is evident that, even if not included in the new Local Plan, then extra development will take place as it always does with reference to special circumstances of some kind. Additionally, we draw attention to our comments associated with Q 11, below.

Having stated the above, we are disappointed that there was not an Option 3 for the Local Plan to return to the assessed quantum need prior to the penalty 20% uplift following the previous plan's withdrawal, or even an Option 4 to reject the Government figures entirely.

BAG strongly urges TMBC to continue challenging the Government's assessment of housing needs as mentioned in Matt Boughton's Foreword to the new plan.

BAG also highlights the fact that the West Malling area has already borne a disproportionate amount of new housing in the last 20 years. Here follows an extract of a 2022 report compiled for BAG regarding local housing developments:

'... the increase in housing in the immediate vicinity of West Malling; that is within a 1 mile radius, the number of dwellings has increased by 3695. Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council covers a 93 square mile area, of which the area surrounding West Malling (including Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange) accounts for 1% of the geographical space of the borough. However, this very small area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings and the associated increase in demand on local services; destruction of natural habitat and green spaces that this entails'.

Option 5 is the best opportunity to match infrastructure & facilities to the development needs.



---

**User Response: Text**

Option 1 and Option 5.

West Malling and Kings Hill currently delivers almost 60% of development in the last 20 years yet accounts for only 1% of the area of TMBC. Other areas should be considered for development.

Assess housing need already accommodating unused planning permissions, completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Existing settlements should retain their identity and not turn in to a continuous urban sprawl. The Metropolitan Green Belt need to extend to the West Malling by-pass

Is the houses are genuinely required this would spread the impact in already crowded areas. Also, experience shows improving and updating facilities doesn't happen as population increases.

The heritage character of the countryside must be preserved. This is what makes Kent special. You risk destroying that important landscape feature.

**Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

**I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.**

**Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.**

---

**User Response: Text**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

**I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.**

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever.

None – we should be seeking to concentrate development outside of greenfield and greenbelt sites and NOT on grade 1 agricultural land.

We should be safeguarding our agricultural land not concreting over it. Out countryside is disappearing at an alarming rate of knots.

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever.

I choose Option 1, all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

It's best to focus development in our towns rather than letting them sprawl. Our towns provide the basis for economic development and it is important that Tonbridge retains its setting and special character.

I choose Option 1, all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

- None of the suggested options reflect the needs of current built communities of the North-East area of the borough
- all options seem to continue with the over expansion of builds within existing built areas – this is not deemed acceptable
- **TMBC encouraged to continue to lobby Government for reduction in allocation**
- **Disproportionate amount of TMBC's new housing has been built in and around West Malling in the last 20 years.**
- A 2022 report compiled for BAG regarding local housing developments:

---

**User Response: Text**

- ‘... the increase in housing in the immediate vicinity of West Malling; that is within a 1 mile radius,
- the number of dwellings has increased by 3695.
- Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council covers a 93 square mile area, of which the area surrounding **West Malling (including Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange) accounts for 1% of the geographical space of the borough.** However, **this very small area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new homes**

This area is greenbelt / greenfield and grade 1 agricultural land. There are plenty of available sites that aren't that could be used instead. These sites have been put forward before. I think it's important that villages have boundaries and this would encroach on this.

**OPTION 1. But every rural community would benefit from some housing.**

**Greenbelt land must be protected to prevent urbanisation**

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

We should be building **only** for international migration, for affordable housing, for a sustainable amount of growth and/or replacing poor, existing housing.

We support Option 3 on the basis that it provides a balanced approach to meeting needs across the Borough. In our view, East Peckham is a wholly appropriate location for new housing.

I choose Option 1, all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

I choose Option 1, all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

Over building in the area with over stretch services, drainage and water run off.

Option 1 is the least worst option.

We should be seeking to concentrate development outside greenfield and greenbelt sites and not on grade 1 agricultural land. Villages should retain their geographical entity and not be allowed to spread into neighboring settlements.

From the meeting held on Tuesday 1st Nov at Trottiscliffe, I understand there to be 5 Options open to the Council

---

## User Response: Text

to fulfil it's statutory duty to build new homes in Tonbridge and Malling.

As was stated, none of the options are attractive, in that the new housing will put even more pressure on roads transport, school, doctors etc. It would appear therefor to be a case of choosing the least worst.

This would appear to be option 3 with option 2 a second to that

My reasoning for this is that all the sites would be in areas where there are already some facilities and it would be a case of improving these rather than starting from scratch.

Smaller villages such as Trottiscliffe have narrow single track roads, poor transport links and no shops as well as being in an area of outstanding natural beauty.

- None of the suggested options reflect the needs of current built communities of the North-East area of the borough
- all options seem to continue with the over expansion of builds within existing built areas – this is not deemed acceptable
- **TMBC encouraged to continue to lobby Government for reduction in allocation**
- **Disproportionate amount of TMBC's new housing has been built in and around West Malling in the last 20 years.**
- A 2022 report compiled for BAG regarding local housing developments:
- '... the increase in housing in the immediate vicinity of West Malling; that is within a 1 mile radius,
- the number of dwellings has increased by 3695.

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council covers a 93 square mile area, of which the area surrounding **West Malling (including Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange) accounts for 1% of the geographical space of the borough.** However, **this very small area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new homes**

My favoured option is **OPTION 1: OUTSIDE** of Green Belt and Areas of National Beauty, which must be protected at all costs.

Whilst all areas need some development, Green Belt was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is therefore sacrosanct.

Selected 1 Option and Option 2

**What are your reasons for selecting this particular spatial strategy option for the Local Plan?**

**Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.**

---

**User Response: Text**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

**I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.**

Focusing development in existing urban areas makes use of existing infrastructure and avoids the untidy sprawl of disconnected developments where inadequate or no infrastructure exists nor is unlikely to be provided in sufficient quantity.

We should be seeking to concentrate development outside of greenfield and greenbelt sites and not on grade 1 agricultural land.

We should also be preventing neighboring towns from merging into one another by maintaining village boundaries, assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

As we are not part of T&M, we hesitate to offer a view. However, the emphasis on The Medway Gap, Snodland and, particularly, Kings Hill in Options 1-4, inclusive, generates considerable concern that traffic volumes passing through our village will increase substantially.

Option 5 would appear to reduce that threat, but, clearly, those T&M residents living close to any new settlement would understandably be very concerned, especially if such new settlement(s) are poorly planned and consulted upon.

We have not selected an option, but have offered comments based on likely impact on traffic generation in already problematic local road infrastructure.

When the previous Local Plan was submitted for examination, the Planning Inspectors raised some significant initial concerns about the evidence base relating to the Green Belt changes. In view of this, we have concerns about how the legal tests (e.g. exceptional circumstances) could now be justified when there are plenty of other sites put forward outside these protected areas. Furthermore, proposals for a substantial Green Belt land release (in view of the alternative sites) would both be contrary to the National Planning Framework (NPPF, 2021, e.g. Para. 140-141) and likely be unjustified (i.e. unsound), given that housing need alone is unlikely to outweigh the harm. In the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, this option generally appears to have been scored just as positively as Options 2 & 3, and has more positive scorings, than the other options. Notwithstanding these observations, about the Option scoring, we are concerned that there is no specific Objective to take account of infrastructure constraints (inc. highways capacity), which is an important consideration when trying to assess the most sustainable spatial strategy (see Q.8 & 11). With reference to Para. 5.5.22 (Reg. 18 L.P.) and TMBC's previous comments (on TWBC Reg. 18

---

### User Response: Text

Consultation), it is acknowledged that there are existing “infrastructure challenges in Tonbridge”. As such, there is limited scope for more development in and around Tonbridge, requiring significant areas of Green Belt, which cannot represent sustainable development without suitable brownfield sites/road capacity. Further east, there is less protected land and bigger strategic roads (e.g. M20) with more capacity, than our roads, so development would have less negative impacts. We support maximising the “use of previously-developing land”, as stated in Option 5. It is also important to prevent the coalescence of surrounding settlements and urban extensions within the countryside buffers of rural settlements, to preserve their rural character and separate identity. Please refer our comments in Question 2, which highlights proposals contrary to these principles.

Option 1 and 2 selected

**Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

**I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.**

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

---

**User Response: Text**

All areas within the greenbelt around Tonbridge comply with requirements set out in the NPPF:

1. Prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. Prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. Safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

**Which spatial strategy option do you prefer? OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing**

**What are your reasons for selecting this spatial strategy option? Greenbelt is and AONB are protected areas for a reason it is not a reusable commodity – there are biodiversity unique environments of nature. At a time where climate change is at the forefront for most countries, UK are getting rid of vast areas of trees and natural habitat to make way for more houses. Green areas are not only good from an ecological viewpoint but also from a mental health viewpoint.**

**Once Greenbelt is gone, it is gone forever, and Greenbelt's main use is openness and to prevent "Coalescence of Settlements" we don't want villages to sprawl into each other, we want them to remain separate and unique villages. If you build on greenbelt, planting shrubs and trees will not replace the biodiverse environment that bugs, insects, animals, reptiles, birds have taken 100s of years to create.**

**There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere**

1. Prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. Prevent neighbouring towns merging.
3. Safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The expansion of Tonbridge beyond existing Green Belt boundaries will result in worsening congestion and air quality. The Green Belt is there to prevent urban sprawl and it should be respected by this Local Plan.

None of the suggested options reflect the needs of current built communities of the North-East area of the borough

- all options seem to continue with the over expansion of builds within existing built areas – this is not deemed acceptable
- **TMBC encouraged to continue to lobby Government for reduction in allocation**
- **Disproportionate amount of TMBC's new housing has been built in and around West Malling in**

---

**User Response: Text**

**the last 20 years.**

- A 2022 report compiled for BAG regarding local housing developments:
- ‘... the increase in housing in the immediate vicinity of West Malling; that is within a 1 mile radius,
- the number of dwellings has increased by 3695.
- Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council covers a 93 square mile area, of which the area surrounding **West Malling (including Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange) accounts for 1% of the geographical space of the borough.** However, **this very small area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new homes**

Least impact on Green Belt and environment.

Building the minimum of houses possible.

Focusing development in existing urban areas makes use of existing infrastructure and avoids the untidy sprawl of disconnected developments where inadequate or no infrastructure exists nor is unlikely to be provided in sufficient quantity.

Small rural settlements are in danger of stagnating with declining service provision. New Housing growth in all of them would provide a welcome stimulus.

I understand that West Malling and Kings Hill only account for 1% of area of TMBC, but has provided 58% of development in last 20 years. Other than Option 1, the remaining options include intrusion into the Green Belt and other countryside areas which is undesirable. Are there any other strategies for locating sites which would minimize the loss of the countryside, whilst still meeting the housing need?

There is absolutely no reason to destroy green belt land in this area. At a time of climate emergency you are looking to rid the area of much needed countryside.

Frankly I'm disgusted it's even on the table for you.

It is the best use of non green belt land with the least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. There is least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. It Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. There are excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. There are thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham and Hale Street.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers



---

### User Response: Text

engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham and Hale Street.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

Nationally we have a housing crisis with approx. 1.5 million homes needed. To answer this the Borough should look at the mechanism to spread the growth to all sustainable locations to both spread the burden and offer choice in size, style and value.

Based on the very high-level scale maps and commentary presented within the Consultation Document and the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (ISA), BDW consider that either Option 3 or Option 4 should be preferred. BDW also generally support Option 2 albeit this option is comparatively less preferable due to the likelihood such a strategy would less effectively spread the benefits of developments across the Borough given its concentration on the top-tier settlements.

### Options 3 and Option 4

Option 3 and Option 4 provide more opportunities to deliver balanced growth across the Borough.

Option 3 focusses development upon on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL), as well as adjacent to, urban areas and rural service centre settlements. This option is more likely to enable the Council to diversify the nature and scale of sites allocated for development. This in turn facilitating the supply of housing and spreading the benefits of growth to a wider range of communities.

Option 4 focusses development on sites within (greenfield as well as PDL) as well as adjacent to urban areas, rural service centres and the other rural settlements to support a range of communities. This option would also likely result in a very broad distribution of growth; however, it will also likely result in growth at locations which are not as accessible, lack services and increase reliance upon travel by private motor vehicles to facilitate for day-to-day needs to access services and facilities. As such, Option 4 is less likely to contribute to sustainable patterns of development than Option 3 contrary to national planning policy objectives.

### Alternative Options

In addition to the options presented in Question 3 of the Consultation Document, BDW would take this opportunity to also raise a broader concern. That none of the identified options or alternative options, explore a strategy for meeting needs through a coordinated cross-boundary strategy. Whilst progressing such a strategy

---

**User Response: Text**

evidently presents political challenges, it is precisely the absence of such a strategy which resulted in the withdrawal of previously submitted Plans in both Tonbridge and Malling Borough, and in Sevenoaks District. This issue is also one of the key risks facing the submitted Tunbridge Wells Local Plan, which is currently at Examination.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, never mind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

**WE SUPPORT Spatial Strategy Option 2 for the borough which has an urban focus** as per the indicative map illustrating this option as set out in Figure 4. In this instance development would be focussed on greenfield and previously developed land within the urban areas as well as land adjacent to these settlements. Thus, locating development in areas with good access to existing services and facilities. Also, option 2 will significantly and positively impact on encouraging sustainable economic growth, business development, and economic inclusion across the borough, and have less of a negative impact on the Mereworth sites listed above [see comments under Downs and Mereworth].

It should be the case that if there is space for development to adjoin or extend from existing, larger settlements, then those should be considered in the first instance. This is due to more developed infrastructure and transport links already being present, and a reduced chance of adverse impact on environmentally and policy constrained land. It would also assist in preserving the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt. In addition, there are limited transport links or room for significant expansion of infrastructure to support development in rural areas of the borough, without significant adverse impacts on biodiversity, landscape character, air quality, cultural heritage, and openness of the Green Belt – as the sustainability appraisal makes clear. The sustainability appraisal further supports the economic case for spatial options 2 and 3, and lesser negative impacts on significant areas of environmental concern. Development should not be permitted in Rural Areas (option 5) – this would cause significant harm to the countryside, and on people’s health and wellbeing who currently reside in these areas, which are widely used for leisure and recreation. In addition, building on grade 1 agricultural land would harm the rural economy.

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing

---

**User Response: Text****Option 1:**

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is built over

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option does not address the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of the developer. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area so should not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

**Option 2:**

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is built over

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of the developer. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area so should not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

---

**User Response: Text****Option 3:**

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is potential to be built over

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of the developer. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area so should not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

**Option 4:**

Much of the most versatile agricultural land in the borough is potential to be built over

Much of the proposed area is in flood plain: More pressure on the most versatile agricultural land

The option only partially addresses the high house price / earnings ratio for the borough which is skewed because of the lack of available homes in the South and East of the borough. Does not follow government guidelines with respect to uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio.

The area is in the Maidstone House Market Area, i.e. relies on Maidstone for urban resources. The roads to Maidstone are subject to a number of Air Quality Monitoring Areas (AQMA) and additional traffic will exacerbate the pollution for residents.

The continual recent development around village centres has meant that most are already overloaded and struggling and more such development will exacerbate the situation.

Kings Hill does not have adequate road transport. Even the main entrance is a private road, closed at the whim of the developer. Many surrounding roads are quiet lanes which would have their character and use for recreation destroyed by such over development.

Kings Hill is NOT an urban area so should not be included as a focus for development. See Office for National Statistics: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/national-statistics-postcode-lookup-2021-census-august-2022/about>

---

**User Response: Text**

Kings Hill does not have the resources of an urban area, such as police station, fire station, ambulance station, library, post office, hotel etc.

**Option 5:**

A new town would become an urban area and would require pre-implementation of infrastructure. It does not seem that TMBC are willing to put in such investment. In addition, much of the land would be more costly for developers to develop, and would likely only be accepted if there was no alternative. In addition, the road network should be the primary focus for development to ensure that adequate connectivity to service centres was provided. Likewise, new connectivity for water, gas and electricity would need to be implemented. There was brownfield land in green belt that was assigned in the previous (withdrawn) local plan, and that should be re-considered, even given the constraints identified here.

**I do not support spatial options 1 – 4** as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture.

**Of the options 1-4, option 4** would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, never mind any addition development.

Traffic and Parking is already an issue due to builder/planners not reserving enough parking for each house based on the number of bedrooms, growing families and making garages too small to get out of a family car even if they could get the car in the garage. When there is a problem on the A228 Kings Hill becomes gridlocked as it did last week when the roads of Kings Hill flooded and a broken down car on the A228. The A228 goes into a single road to Mereworth and cannot take the traffic now especially if there is a problem on Seven Mile Lane which is also a single road not built for the purpose of carrying the volumes of traffic and size of lorries on the road these days not meant for villages

GP – the local surgery cannot cope at the moment and many people have to use private medical services because they cannot get an appointment. The queues before 8 in the morning outside the GP is ridiculous. Additional houses will add to this problem and may even add to fatalities because of lack of GP's and building another surgery will not solve the problem if Gp's do not want to work in Kings Hill.

Schools – Local schools are full and no Secondary school on Kings Hill pupils are forced to use Public transport ( which looks like being culled in February) meaning more cars trying to leave Kings Hill by the only exits onto A228

Stores/Shops- The existing stores are at capacity with the current population (ne Aldi may relieve some of this) amenities at present are insufficient for the current population

Public Transport – Poor , expensive and non-existent on Sunday. To be culled in February with no bus to the station and others being cut.

---

**User Response: Text**

**Option 5** of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough.

It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing  
Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever

To expand beyond will cause extreme congestion. Other nearby developments are under way - making almost gridlock in peak times. General decline of a rural area.

[Options 1 and 2]

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

---

**User Response: Text**

[Options 1 and 2]

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

**OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing**

**Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever**

**Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is it forever**

I choose Option 1, all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

Whilst all areas need some development, Green Belt was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is sacrosanct.

Whilst all areas need some development, Green Belt was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is sacrosanct.

This area is greenbelt / greenfield and grade 1 agricultural land. There are plenty of available sites that aren't that could be used instead. These sites have been put forward before. I think it's important that villages have boundaries and this would encroach on this.

We should be seeking to concentrate development outside of greenfield and greenbelt sites and not on grade 1

---

**User Response: Text**

agriculture land.

We should also be preventing neighboring towns from merging into one another by maintaining village boundaries, assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

Option 1, but there is a case for small scale development for local community housing needs in rural areas.

Greenbelt must be protected, it is a precious environment and once it has gone, there is no going back, it is lost forever.

- Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are sacrosanct. The purpose of Green Belt is to protect the countryside and prevent urban sprawl. AONBs should not be subjected to harmful development.

Option 1 , but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it is gone, that is forever

Greenbelt is too precious, it cannot be replaced. Losing hedges and other greenbelt areas will affect wildlife and biodiversity negatively. The impact could create flood risks where there is lack of soil drainage.

Option2 with some option 4

Option2 :Urban areas have the infrastructure to cope with new development,

Option4 Some small development in all locations to cover natural local growth.

**OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing**

**Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever**

My favoured option is **OPTION 1: OUTSIDE** of GREEN BELT and AONB which must be protected at all costs.

Whilst all areas need some development, GREEN BELT was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is sacrosanct.

**INFRASTRUCTURE** - is already crumbling - it must be upgraded before a single brick is laid



---

**User Response: Text**

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

I believe it is important to concentrate development outside of greenfield and greenbelt sites and not on grade 1 agricultural land.

It is also important to prevent the neighbouring towns merging into one another by maintaining village boundaries, We should assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, assist in urban regeneration

**Options 1 and 2**

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

**Options 1 and 2**

Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.

---

**User Response: Text**

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.

I choose Option 1, all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

I choose Option 1, any development if really needed should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

I choose Option 1, all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

Greenbelt and AONB should be respected and brownfield sites prioritized. There are significant brownfield sites in the Borough and Borough Green in particular.

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever.

OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever

We should be seeking to concentrate development outside of greenfield and greenbelt sites and not on grade 1 agricultural land. Also preventing neighbouring towns merging onto one another by maintaining village boundaries, assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, assist in urban regeneration.

Because we should avoid developing other centres where this would lead to the joining of settlements.

I do not support spatial options 1-4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural

---

**User Response: Text**

land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has place on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development. Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

- None of the options are supported as each assumes expansion of Kings Hill
- Kings Hill should remain within the confines of its airbase brownfield site as per previous plans.
- Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the coalescence of communities.
- As a principal however, I agree that the development of brownfield is preferable to destroying open countryside and valuable farmland.

I understand that West Malling and Kings Hill only account for 1% of area of TMBC, but has provided 58% of development in last 20 years. Other than Option 1, the remaining options include intrusion into the Green Belt and other countryside areas which is undesirable. Are there any other strategies for locating sites which would minimize the loss of the countryside, whilst still meeting the housing need?

I choose Option 1, all development should take place outside Greenbelt and AONB.

Greenbelt is not reusable. Once it is gone it cannot be replaced.

Focusing development in existing urban areas makes use of existing infrastructure and avoids the untidy sprawl of disconnected developments where inadequate or no infrastructure exists nor is unlikely to be provided in sufficient quantity.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough.

It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater

---

**User Response: Text**

Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

BAG cannot justify supporting any of the options offered on the basis that in each there is an assumption of expanding, in particular, Kings Hill which was always intended to be a development which remained within the confines of its airbase brownfield site. Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the inevitable coalescence of communities.

As a principal however, BAG believes the development of brownfield as preferable to destroying open countryside and valuable farmland.

[Options 1 and 2]

**Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

**I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites. The appropriate infrastructure needs to be in place before any approval is made to ensure minimal impact to existing residents**

Reluctantly accepting option 1.

I think that the assessed need is too high.

Keep Green Belt safe and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

---

**User Response: Text**

Q3 /Q4 : I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, never mind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, never mind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field

---

**User Response: Text**

land, which I would not support.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, never mind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, never mind any addition development.

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

---

**User Response: Text**

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

Answer: Option 4 I think that all communities need housing for young families from the locality and see no reason why rural villages should be exempt. There should be a range of housing, including 1 and 2 bed flats and affordable starter homes. Not 5-bed executive housing. The amount of development should be proportionate to the size of the settlement. Option 5 appears to be Borough Green Garden City, which is an option that urbanises the area forming continuous development between Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green and North Ightham.

[Options 1 & 2 selected]

**Best use of non green belt land with least harm to character areas and areas with limited infrastructure. Least risk of creating flooding problems within the borough. Involves cheaper areas in which to buy and rent therefore will naturally create more affordable housing than elsewhere in the borough. Excellent transport links and roads for much of the areas in Options 1 and 2. Thriving towns with great infrastructure nearby.**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

**I am concerned to ensure that relevant Agencies (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, NHS, Utility companies) engage robustly with the Local Planning consultation process. I am also concerned about Developers engaging with those Agencies meaningfully, to ensure timely and robust consultations in relation to specific sites.**

Whilst all areas need some development, Green Belt was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is sacrosanct.

I do not support spatial options 1 – 4 as they will all result in an expansion of Kings Hill beyond the original brownfield footprint. The area surrounding Kings Hill is mixture of Green Belt, useful high grade agricultural land, and important woodlands which are essential for carbon capture. Of the options 1-4, option 4 would be the preferred option as this would spread the development most evenly across the borough and is most likely to result in development being focused on the brownfield sites in the borough. It should also be noted that in the last 20 years, the area around West Malling (including Kings Hill) has suffered from a disproportionate quantity of new housing in the last 20 years. A report compiled for the Broadwater Action Group found that despite accounting for 1% of the geographical space of the borough, the West Malling area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings with the associated demand this has placed on local services and green spaces. The transport link and essential services (in particular doctors and dentists) are not able to cope with the current burden, nevermind any addition development.

---

**User Response: Text**

Option 5 of an entirely new development in the borough would result in even more destruction of green field land, which I would not support.

- Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty must not be violated.
  - The purpose of Green Belt is to protect the countryside, prevent urban sprawl and prevent the merging of neighbouring towns into one another. They provide a mechanism for defining limits to development.
  - AONBs should not be subjected to harmful development.

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:09:43. Total records: 1061



---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 6] What are your reasons for selecting this particu...

### User Response: Text

bjbkjbb

As I have said throughout there is a shocking under resourcing of affordable homes be those rented or priced accordingly our younger generation cannot get on the housing ladder and rent is so high they cannot afford this either the current developments are being bought not by local people but by investment companies including asset stripping buy to rent conglomerates the unmet need I'd for good quality social housing. As a responsible council there needs to be ring fencing of homes for rent managed by not for profit housing associations .

What the hell is this?

Historically demand always outstrips growth

The borough is full. Our villages and settlements cannot cope with more houses. If more are to be built, build a new town, plan it and get it right. By planning what will effectively be a new town we can allow for growth, unlike Kings Hill which has been enlarged piece meal without thought for access, schools or shopping.

Housing provision should be based on need not greed. The Government has promised to level up the country, investing in less affluent areas, and there should be less immigration into the South East from other regions in the years ahead.

I don't want either. I had to select one, I selected the least destructive one

If there are unbuilt on sites that already have planning permission, they will provide any extra housing. How accurate are the government figures? The new government is quite likely to change the numbers.

Contingency is needed for the timeline which is being considered.

It is sensible to have some 'reserve' as we don't know what future housing needs will be

In line with the NPPF (para 61) we suggest that as an absolute minimum TMBC should be aiming to meet the figure of 839 dwellings per annum based on the 2021 standard method calculation. In practice, the Council should be aiming to meet the assessed housing need with an additional 10% supply. This would provide flexibility and resilience into the housing supply. A buffer would help ensure a reliable supply in the event of potential non-implementations, delays to delivery (including beyond the plan period), and economic factors within the market. A buffer would also be seen as an effective method of ensuring security within the supply against future changes to the local housing requirement within the methodology, for example in case of new affordability data that increases the requirement. However, the selection of 10% as the buffer figure would benefit from further justification for this to be a sound approach.

It is likely that a buffer is needed to account for non-delivery of certain sites within anticipated timescales. It is sensible to plan for this as a sudden drop in housing supply could undermine the whole plan and risk speculative development.

I think that the forecast numbers for housing need are over-exaggerated and date from a time when there was large number of EU citizens living in the county, many of whom have returned to their countries of origin.

It's bad enough trying to find the room for the assessed housing need, without adding more housing voluntarily.

More houses in the South East are not going to solve the issues. All they will do is push the existing housing stock prices up further, as they will be more expensive and will set a new norm.

---

**User Response: Text**

Until the government succeeds in levelling up the rest of the country (not looking likely any time soon) the draw of living close to London in the south east will remain high.

If the needs are assessed accurately and are updated post Brexit/pandemic, including much more emphasis on affordable housing (flats) including for the elderly thus allowing for ease of downsizing, rather than the needs of Greater London or aspirations of folks wanting to access our schools, there will be less need for more upscale, expensive new housing in rural locations.

Assad housing needs may change

Too much housing already therefore try and reduce increases to minimum

There is already too much house building in our borough .

The current formula used by central government to assess local housing targets is flawed and doesn't relate to the situation on the ground. The pandemic has changed property markets. London cannot keep emptying out into the neighbouring counties and a mass of empty properties in London will, I think, reverse the trend in future. Property prices in the South East are artificially inflated and some 'levelling up' should mean housing moving into less populated counties instead of stuffing more and more into one corner of the country.

less

Meeting the need is satisfactory. Exceeding it is not necessary as there will undoubtedly be a new or revised plan again in 2040

There is no need to increase our housing allocation beyond that which is required. The sustainability appraisal findings show significantly poorer results against most of the criteria for Option B compared with Option A.

We don't believe that the infrastructure for this need will ever be put in place by the Government to enable basic needs of all the houses to be met. See Kingshill as an example.

As a finance officer I always believe in a 10% excess for unforeseen changes to the plan.

The council must continue to challenge the housing targets set by gov which seem wholly excessive and appear to fail to take into account the size and unique mix of land including AONB historic settlements prime agricultural land and restrictive supporting infrastructure outside of the councils control.

Plan for the future

Neither really

Not sure if +10% relates to housing only. If so, then I don't like either of these options. The future proofing should relate not only to housing but also to possible increased need for medical, educational and infrastructure matters.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested. We are 70% Green Belt; much of our area is flood plain; roads are highly congested - hard to absorb more housing.

---

**User Response: Text**

I do not believe the quota is suitable for our area. It is far to high.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorb CO2, provide wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic on roads that are already congested.

I think that building up to 10% extra housing will undermine the stated principles of the Local Plan.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Again please use plain English what does this mean? I have a degree but this is impenetrable!

Fulfills the need whilst limiting loss of environment.

I question the need or indeed advisability of the quoted figure of 15,000 (approx) new houses. Such development in this borough would dramatically change the character of the area from semi-rural / rural (in the main) to urban in many locations.

Clearly, the country has a severe housing need but this figure about 25% of the existing housing in the borough. Apparently the government is aiming to build 300K homes per year to meet the national need. Given the nature of TMB, I think what we are being required to build is seriously excessive.

Government should be asked to explain why it thinks we need such drastic growth.

This is Hobsons choice!

Why accept more than is quoted. Home counties as a whole are over developed.

The fewer new developments the better

We can always build more.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The office of national statistics disputes the housing numbers advocated by the government.

---

**User Response: Text**

If you're meeting assessed housing needs why would you need to add 10% more? Housing demand is like lanes on the M25, there will never be enough as demand always matches supply.

The aims of this Local Plan should be realistic and not take into account unknown requirements.

I believe assessed housing should be deducted by 50% at least!

There is no reason in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses.

We should build only affordable housing or replacing poor housing.

While I accept that there is a shortage of housing, particularly affordable housing, it is difficult to see how we are going to accommodate even the assessed housing need without completely wrecking the neighbourhoods we live in.

In line with the NPPF (para 61) we suggest that as an absolute minimum TMBC should be aiming to meet the figure of 839 dwellings per annum based on the 2021 standard method calculation. In practice, the Council should be aiming to meet the assessed housing need with an additional 10% supply. This would provide flexibility and resilience into the housing supply. A buffer would help ensure a reliable supply in the event of potential non-implementations, delays to delivery (including beyond the plan period), and economic factors within the market. A buffer would also be seen as an effective method of ensuring security within the supply against future changes to the local housing requirement within the methodology, for example in case of new affordability data that increases the requirement. However, the selection of 10% as the buffer figure would benefit from further justification for this to be a sound approach.

Para 4.2.17 is in error - the options are reversed. Does this invalidate the entire consultation?

We are being asked to choose between A) A number we don't understand, and B) A slightly bigger number we don't understand. So I'll choose the smaller number.

Government housing targets may reduce

The +10% will most likely end up being unaffordable, non-council housing that only goes to benefit the developers whilst killing off more of our green spaces.

I don't support either quantum option. 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.

There has to be a figure for general population growth. Any attempt to restrict growth would lead to house price over-inflation as households sell at a premium. Local schools will also have to restrict 'new-to-area' applications unless growth (even if arbitrarily set at +10%) is restricted.

Plan for what is required, there may be a plus or minus, but over the course of 15 years it should net out to the plan. Hence what is the logic in creating a +10% option - it implies a lack of faith in the basic planning assumptions!

Also, it appears that the outcome of this question has been pre-judged seeing as the SA has been done at the +10% option.

There are office buildings in the borough which will increasingly become redundant to 2040 - Kings Hill for example . Change planning use and free these up for residential development

The Plan will not be accepted unless the Government's housing target is met.

TMBC has already notified the Government why the housing target is unrealistic given that 77% of the Borough have AONB or Green Belt protection. It is therefore illogical for TMBC to plan for a 10% higher target.

I believe the Assessed Housing Need is ambitious in itself and I hope that TMBC will be much more timely in producing the next Local Plan so that we do not run up against a further problem with land supply.

---

**User Response: Text**

I agree with the Option 1 findings from the ISA Table 4.1 findings.

It is evident from the Sustainability Appraisal that these proposed developments require major work to infrastructure, to protect water courses and water supply, to control contaminants such as sewage and chemicals, to defend against the impact of climate change and to achieve zero carbon. It is not clear to me that TMBC has taken on board the gravity of the Sustainability Appraisal, or intends to do anything about it. Public opinion is ahead of institutions and perhaps the council will offer more ambitious and credible solutions in years to come with houses and places designed to cope with climate change and full redress to the extreme pressure on nature.

Understanding there is a need for more housing, but does this housing all have to be in the South East? There is no way to satisfy the assessed housing needs without significant damage to the existing neighbourhoods.

Make use of old derelict buildings in towns instead of building new homes

Housing supply is needed to bring the cost down.

I believe that the identified need for 16000 dwellings is far too large. Given it represents nearly 1 in 3 new dwellings in a period of just 15 years, it will be impossible to provide the infrastructure to support this scale of change.

Plus as noted above will we have 30% more surgeries, local transport, schools, car parks.

Will the electricity, gas, sewage infrastructure, roads cope with 30% bigger loads. These will also need to be in place before the majority of the development.

Again I believe this target of 16000 is frankly ludicrous.

We are already being required to meet a disproportionate housing target, (a 28% increase if I understand it). We should not go beyond that.

While there is a need for housing for Borough residents, especially for affordable housing, the area is already over populated compared with the rest of England outside of the cities, with inadequate infrastructure of all types. Excess housing is likely to be for yet more expensive 'executive homes' and will attract still more very affluent people while doing nothing for the housing of lower paid local residents and making the problems of health care and schools even worse as potential employees cannot afford to live here.

If you go above and beyond, the larger number you achieve will simply become the case upon which to grow. So you're shooting yourself in the foot.

I prefer there to be fewer houses and to only keep up with the minimum amount of development required in order to protect our green spaces

---

**User Response: Text**

To avoid additional harm to the Green Belt, biodiversity, and pressure on infrastructure - particularly on roads in the Borough that are already congested, but also pressure on schools and medical facilities. Also, agree with TMBC's assessment that there are likely to be more negative outcomes from Option B.

I anticipate housing needs will slow as a result of Brexit and more distributed workforces

If we build 10% more houses that needs 10% more infrastructure which will probably be difficult to finance, and if there are houses they will eventually be taken if only by private landlords and encourage people to come to the area which we do not want.

There should be a drive to refurbish/repurpose offices and homes that are unused and have been vacant for some time to accommodate some of the housing need. The government should make laws to enable fair private rentals for all and offer less chance to buy at significantly reduced rates from housing associations etc which takes those properties out of the housing needs market.

The South East of the country is already too congested with insufficient infrastructure in place. To add an additional 10% of housing in excess of need will add further pressure which cannot be sustained.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

Do not plan to build more than the allocation. In fact you should be challenging the allocation and setting precedent that it is extremely difficult to meet it in the first place.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The level of house building has been too low for decades so we need to rectify that and also to address future need.

Primarily the cost of land is very expensive in our community, therefore any developer would shy away from developing low- cost community homes, or investing in the necessary infrastructure.

Equally the cost to the Council of contributing towards these developments would be prohibitive in view of diminishing

---

**User Response: Text**

funds available to Local Government. Also the home- owners in many of the sites in the Borough wish to protect the value of their homes, quite rightly.

In addition, it is essential (and will probably become mandatory) that there is Local Government investment in Green Technology. This is highly desirable for current and future residents who hope to live longer in an environment free of pollution e.g., extra traffic, waste etc.

Also fundamentally important, before adding to existing housing needs is a funded legal commitment from all utility companies to provide the investment in infrastructure particularly water, power and broadband to rural areas. We have seen this summer that there is no capacity to meet increased need if there is an issue, for example, with lack of rainfall.

NO new building, (and particular not an extra 10%) should take place without this investment FIRST.

Finally, development in addition to that of assessed need should consider the probability of a falling population nationally, and be targeted at areas in the country which are suffering denuded populations i.e. levelling up.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high - it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare, and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Development should be concentrated in urban areas and built on brownfield sites rather than spread more diffusely

I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads in and around Tonbridge.

To avoid indiscriminate housing sprawl.

To ensure green spaces and AONB are maintained and over development does not occur within the borough.

I hope that more opportunities will become available in other regions in the time period and would not wish to deter people from choosing to live there.

We are running out of green space in the East of the Borough and we must preserve and protect what little remains.

It's important that people and their communities are considered, alongside the need for increased housing. We need well connected public transport, sustainable energy generation, schools, arts, NHS healthcare, community spaces and all of the other things that people need in order to form communities.

---

**User Response: Text**

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

While the quantum options are objectively assessed, this does not mean that they are correct.

It is not clear that the options factor in changes in behaviour that have resulted from the pandemic. In particular, the ability to work from home for many people has allowed them to consider living in other areas of the UK where there is a cheaper supply of housing, rather than needing to be in commuting distance of London.

The Housing Needs Assessment that is used to drive the two quantum simply ducks this issue. It says "This report has been prepared during the COVID-19 pandemic. The impact this may have on population projections, the economy and dwelling need will emerge in due course." The only real assessment it makes on the impact of the pandemic and the rapid shift to working from home is in paragraph 5.10, which explores the type of house people are seeking, rather than what part of the country they wish to move to. Data in paragraph 5.10 are based on an online survey with a 12% response rate - these are poor quality data to be basing important decisions on.

It is surprising that Option C Quantum 2 - Meeting Assessed Housing need minus up to 10% has not been considered as plausible.

A 20 year plan that does not properly consider the impact of the most dramatic and sudden shift in working patterns in living memory is not an appropriate plan.

I do not believe the assessed housing need is valid for the area, I believe it is too high, so have chosen the option to limit it to the extent that I can. Following this need will increase the strain on local infrastructure and services, including road congestion and healthcare services.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Northeast area of Borough. Already within the Medway Gap and Valley there are a number of developments with outline planning permission that will adversely affect Aylesford Parish communities and increase the density of housing and create



---

**User Response: Text**

additional transport congestion.

The local plan baseline assumes that the Medway Gap and Valley has the required local infrastructure and current services available, as it suggested theses will play a key role in further development plans and transport requirements. These assumptions in the local plan are inaccurate.

Quantum plus 10%. Figure 10. Potentially this will identify the area situated between the Medway Gap and Kings Hill incorporating East Malling and Ditton to increase in size!

-

Housing needs should be restricted on green belt land and areas of outstanding natural beauty.

I think there is very little land suitable for building and so it will be challenging to meet assessed housing need. Even harder to meet 10% more

Plan to build only what we need

Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.s

Reluctantly accepting Option 1. I believe that the assessed need is already too high. The Borough is already overcrowded - it will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services health and educational and more congestion on roads in and around Tonbridge.

Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

At present, I am unclear about the actual assessed housing needs and who the main target groups are - those on the housing register, first time buyers, affordable housing etc. I would like to see a greater level of detail regarding the projected housing targets and who the provision is actually for.

Given that T&M are currently appealing against the assessed housing need, and that this figure is already challenging and excessive, adding a further 10% seems unnecessary. It would be better to model a scenario based on a figure that the current infrastructure, especially roads and healthcare, can support, and that will not adversely impact on air quality.

Selecting option 1 was a fait accompli. 4 options should be presented.

Option 3 - Return to the assessed need prior to the 20% penalty imposed due to the last plans withdrawal.

Option 4 - Reject central governments figures entirely.

---

**User Response: Text**

Assessed Housing need is a minimum standard required and this should be increased by +10% to allow more choice, increases deliverability and would provide a range of different developments to come forward - squarely meeting key SA Objective 14. TMBC acknowledges that the borough has high house prices and increased supply will help to deliver more affordable choices.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge

Development within the commuter belt in which T&M falls, has consistently provided housing for residents from London. This has had several effects on local housing: 1) as we try to build for the local community, we still have a housing shortage 2) our housing prices become inflated 3) our transport systems, both public and private vehicles, become more congested & suffer more demand by commuters.

No option to object

Kings Hill over developed, infrastructure does not service the local need causing local flooding of roads during inclement weather and traffic jams in peak periods

I see no reason to add additional housing stock on top of the assessed need which in itself as a modelled calculation is not precise and the data supplied will not be 100% accurate for various reasons. Therefore the assessed need is a best guess and will be +/- and I know factor of actual need. Adding 10% merely screws this error factor one way and is a sop to demand which is not the same as need,

Reluctantly accepting Option 1 I believe that the assessed need is already too high - it is based on an out of date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by covid and brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. this addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as health care and education and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge

Don't see a need to build more than we think we'll need and it's going to be hard enough to do that.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1. I believe that the assessed need is already too high. it is based on an out of date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

---

**User Response: Text**

The Local Plan will need to seek to Standard Method in full. The Government's present "capped" figure for this amounts to 839 dwellings per annum. The Local Plan should have regard to potential for meeting "uncapped" needs (above the capped figure) to respond to potential unmet need from neighbouring authorities.

Reluctantly accepting question 1 I believe that the assessed need is already too high. It is based on an out of date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by covid and brexit. The borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as health care and education and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge

We recognise there is a need for more housing throughout the UK but it needs to be done sympathetically to suit the area where the building is to be carried out.

Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

West Kent is already saturated. There are vast areas of unpopulated land further north in the UK

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The least amount of new houses as possible. We have enough, leave green sites and woodlands alone!!

Plus a lot of the reason people accept smaller gardens with relatively high house prices is because we are surrounded by woods and green space. That offset justification just won't be there and I think it could affect the value of houses.

Obviously it's option A but I don't agree that the assessed housing need is appropriate. The government has lots of options of lots of different areas to develop around the UK and constantly chooses to over populate and ruin the South of the country. There are lots of amazing opportunities near cities up north such as Manchester, Birmingham etc. It is no longer all about London. Development should be UK wide, not just over populating the South but trying to invest in the North also.

The quantum given already appears to high for the geography and demographics of the area (ie. Very rural, little local industry). With the economic outlook as it is and the strong possibility that there will be a fall in house purchases with rising interest rates it would be imprudent to over-estimate that requirement.

Need to protect the green belt land and avoid building in the smaller villages.

Housing need in this area needs to be reassessed to reflect the fact that the borough is 70% greenbelt. The numbers are

---

**User Response: Text**

inflated by the 23% uplift so are inaccurate anyway.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge, which are already at breaking point at peak times.

The housing quota under discussion will already put significant pressure on current resources and the landscape of the borough. I think it would be better to increase the percentage of affordable housing within the assessed housing need total, and to ensure this percentage is enforced, as that is where the greatest need lies.

Need another choice ....so that housing is built with a view to local needs, affordable and replacing poor housing ...not with a view to attract more people moving into the area from places where they already have houses.

If anything this is still too high a figure, adding 16% to the housing stock in this region does not appear to reflect the HMG aspirations for "levelling up" the country.

Wateringbury has the worst pollution at the crossroads ( at rush hour) in all of KENT. Therefore ANY, extra housing is a threat to the residents of Wateringbury, we will be a burden to the NHS ,every additional home will mean another vehicle. Pollution is a serious worry, there is a school, & a nursery school, a village hall at the crossroads, many young & older people coming & going at the cross roads, so children would be affected by the health risks , all ages affected.

WE should be keeping building volumes as low as practicable

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Keep the numbers manageable as possible to ensure quality of life for your residents.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The plan already seems ambitious enough. Identify empty properties and bring these into available stock.

**User Response: Text**

All development should be outside the greenbelt and AONB. Once it is gone it is gone forever. We must preserve the green open spaces between our adjacent villages to keep their individual identity.

we will struggle to find enough houses with current figures which are questionable

It appears that if a local authority has any overage in housing allocation it is constantly challenged by Neighbouring LPA's

Given the policy that has been adopted by TWBC to elect to allocate almost 50% of its total housing allocation on TMBC borders leaving all revenues within TWBC and all the costs to TMBC .  
until neighbouring authorities start to think outside the box and collectively working together to solve the housing issues that are not just in their own Borough but understand the need and requirement of all neighbouring LPAs such as transportation, flooding, education, infrastructure employment we will sadly continue to see the demise of these wonderful communities .

i think the need is already too high. It is based on pre 2014 population figures and makes np allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Quantum 3	- Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"
-----------	---

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

We should be building only for international migration, and for affordable, replacing poor housing, and not market

I feel that our region is already highly over-pressured in terms of services & infrastructure. As such I feel that meeting our requirements rather than exceeding makes most sense.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

I do not believe the allocation of c 15400 houses is appropriate and so do not opt for either option.

---

**User Response: Text**

Cost of housing etc in the area is making it less affordable all the time for more and more people.

My preference is to minimise the amount of development as we have sufficient housing in TMBC and infrastructure is already stretched to the limit. Therefore any future development should be kept to a minimum and much less than the c16,000 proposed.

The known significant planning developments c6,000 that are already being submitted for consideration or have been passed would allow for any current housing needs.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The increased need for housing is currently driven by immigration. This will hopefully reduce once the war in Ukraine is finished

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Too many houses for this site as it will not cope with the drainage and infrastructure.

It is understood that the Government's top-down target of 15,941 is to be challenged and if successful, the target will

---

**User Response: Text**

reduce; therefore why would you consider an additional 10% at this stage. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal report, Ch 4: 4.6 - 4.10 states that the proposed target would have a negative result on nearly all of the SA objectives (1-13) and a target plus 10% would be significantly worse in some cases.

Local services especially healthcare and education cannot deal with the existing demand. Anything more than the assessed need will cripple services in the borough.

The borough is already very populated so it is important to limit development

A decision has to be made about how developed TM area is to become; meeting identified needs is expansion enough. Additional development may well happen, in any case, from individual planning requests.

*QUANTUM 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"*

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

Meeting the immediate need -not for the unknown.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Because I do not feel much more development within Kings Hill residential areas would be conducive to good clean living which I understand KCC are aiming for. We cannot continue to develop KH and surround the area with dwellings. I should be interested to know who is going to buy said dwellings when the starting price for a house on KH is approximately £450,000! This is not in the sphere of first time buyers or for those people born within KH /West Malling / East Malling & Leybourne. One has to have a very well paid job in the City and not in Kent, in order to be able to purchase a property.

---

**User Response: Text**

I believe that the Council has a hard job trying to identify land for housing targets set by Government, but I do feel it should be up to each Council to identify land in their areas only as long as the Councils ensure green belt land is preserved and previously developed land is used. If Option B was to be adopted then other Councils who do not know anything about neighbouring Council areas/land could try to pass some of their housing quota to those areas when they do not have the knowledge of that area to ensure it is capable of dealing with more development in that areas. The sensible solution would be for Government to allocate reasonable targets in the first place to each Council. Not everyone needs to live in the South East of England anymore, we have seen since Covid that people can live in other parts of the Country and work in the South of England now that we have such good online facilities.

With climate change, Brexit, home working after covid etc - I'd imagine that living in the South east will gradually become less attractive, certainly over a 20 year time horizon. So even meeting up hat is currently assessed as required might be too much.

There are more than two answers to question 5. Why should Kings Hill (which has already been heavily developed) have to support yet more housing? Targets for even more development are unreasonable and, in the case of the 20% uplift, punitive for local residents

I believe that the calculated need (OAN?) is too high as it is based on outdated (2014) population data.

There is no allowance for changing demographics due to home working, re-location and the ageing population of the area.

Health, education and social services are already overstretched.

option A may well need to be met but not in some of the totally inappropriate areas proposed. Option B is unnecessary and excessive.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

I don't see the requirement for either quantum option. The whole plan is complicated enough with out adding this facet.

The Borough is already overcrowded, and additional building will add to already overstretched education and healthcare services. The congestion on roads will be horrific.

There is already a huge amount of unoccupied dwellings and redundant commercial property in the UK and no doubt within the borough which which could be renovated and made habitable. These and the already approved planning applications that are not being executed would no doubt meet a significant proportion of the housing need. These should be factored in and an allowance should not be made for second homes or internal migration (which should net-out across the country)



---

**User Response: Text**

Government (Westminster) has set National country wide targets - Assessed Housing Needs -which do not seem to take into consideration local conditions i.e. three close proximity/linked commuter towns - Tonbridge, Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells. These three towns are all trying to meet the same targets which will inevitably lead to adjacent developments on either side of the shared borders.

There should be no voluntary offer to increase the Assessed Housing Need that will only increase local planning problems.

It will already be difficult to find the houses required in this Borough

The housing needs are laid out in the Local Plan, housing built beyond the set-out need is surplus to requirement (or if it is not surplus, the need stated is not correct). Building beyond the need unnecessarily risks the natural environment.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brown field areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

We only need to meet the assessed housing need

we need to meet the housing need but avoid over development

Option 1 is the lesser of two evils. The infrastructure and resources of the borough are insufficient to deal with an increased demand.

I am a little dubious about your phrasing of "objectively assessed need" - I thought the 15k+ houses target had come from National Govt. I shall carry on reading the documents and perhaps the answer will be in there. But frankly my view on extra housing is that if you build it people will move in. TMBC's location so close to London and (historically) Europe makes it a desirable location. I would like to know more about how this need has been assessed - and if some of the figure is to provide what is effectively temporary housing for non-UK residents.

If this has been objectively assessed, it should be followed.

We need to meet the housing need but avoid over development

The requirement should be met, which includes a buffer. However, much of the increase is associated with the high house

---

**User Response: Text**

price / earnings ratio, which will not be affected by the proposed development and as such, the local plan should reflect the government guidance on the location of the required development, ie. in brownfield sites in urban areas, especially where there is a locally high house price / earnings ratio. Housing assessed need is warped by the high price in the green belt areas, and this needs to be addressed.

Requirement should be met including a buffer. Housing assessed need is warped by the high price in the green belt areas, and this needs to be addressed. Local plan should reflect government guidance on the location of planned development ie in brownfield sites in urban areas.

One would assume that assessed needs already factor in anticipated growth over coming years and should be assessed on an ongoing basis to ensure that they remain fit for purpose. To plan at this stage for incremental need beyond the currently assessed level would only serve to unnecessarily add pressures to the planning process and potentially earmark sites for development that will not ultimately be required.

Because I do not believe that much more development within Kings Hill's residential areas would be conducive to the clean environment that is apparently KCC's aim. We cannot sustain this endless development in Kings Hill without detriment to the whole environment!

It would be interesting to know who is going to purchase these affordable!! and unaffordable!! dwellings when the starting price for a Kings Hill house is around £450,000!!! There must be a queue of well-to-do buyers for these homes!!

It is difficult to fully assess the requirements based on the numbers provided but the 'Assessed Housing Need' already appears to cater for a c.30% increase in housing stock that would contemplate a potential population increase of up to 40% for the borough. This is significant given the strain already on some urban and rural areas of the borough. Moreover, seeking options for potentially 17,500 dwellings might unnecessarily force the decision to select and develop, particularly green belt, land across the borough. It might also give a false sense of capacity (that does not exist) for neighbouring borough councils to seek to exploit for overspill for their own development plans. Again, Tonbridge is already facing negative consequences from the development of Capel and Tudeley, which we should not seek to add to, even as a risk, in this Local Plan.

TMBC's Housing Need assessment ought to be minus 50%. What is the migratory data of home owners at Kings Hill, Lancaster Park, Hermitage Lane and other recent similar developments? TMBC will be aware of the increased population within the region and of course new homes will attract some buyers from outside the locality? The focus here should be to provide for the majority of people already living in the area. In case I have missed the document, where in the Local Plan is provision made for independent living, supported living, and convalescence homes?

I prefer Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge. Also it is not clear on what basis the +10% is factored in.

---

**User Response: Text**

Due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The evidence shows this area does not require more housing and others should take first place

Increased density of development will create a more sustainable future, and reduce travel and commuting by infrastructure upgrades and technology changes which will remove car ownership, and make sure mobility asset such as cars are shared and effectively used, reducing congestion and wasted investment resource.

With a much reduced birth rate in the UK, are we likely to see a decline in population? Will the population want to continue living in the South East? We cannot tell, so why build more houses than are needed? Once green space is gone, it is gone for good.

As earlier explained, the projected "housing need" is misleadingly high, mainly because it uses the wrong measure of affordability. In addition, more building will not reduce house prices at all significantly, as was shown by the research for the official Barker Report on housing supply of 2004.

The assessed housing need probably won't actually be met through this plan due to planning barriers, NIMBYs, legal challenges etc. Planning for the extra may make it more likely that the original target will be met. Also, we don't know what will happen over the next 18 years. Increasing the housing stock +10% will help to maintain affordability.

Of the two Quanta suggested I have indicated a preference for Option A but believe that T&M residents should have been given the opportunity to give the Borough Council a mandate to set the new housing figure lower than the Assessed Housing need, either at the level of the last local plan (prior to the arbitrary 20% uplift) or even something less than that. The Office of National Statistics (ONS) - Population Increase Projection gives an anticipated population increase of 5.7% for England between 2020 and 2040. The Assessed Housing Need currently requires a massive 30% increase in dwellings over approximately the same period. This is so worrying and not supported by ONS projections. Even taking into account the continuing move away from the nuclear family, the only way a 30% increase in housing supply would be required would be for continuing significant migration into the Borough from London and its suburbs, which would be to the significant detriment of existing communities. There are many people wishing to move out to "the country" from higher cost housing areas to somewhere like Tonbridge and Malling where their housing budget money, be it as a home owner or renter, can go much further. This both worsens the housing affordability crisis for existing local families and squeezes the availability of housing for existing residents.

There is no point in building houses to attract additional people to the area who already have houses in other areas.

---

**User Response: Text**

Levelling Up may mean that other parts of the UK are in higher demand than the South East.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Whilst I understand it is good to be prepared we have no idea what our needs will be going forward so don't believe the additional 10% to be necessary

none of the above we should only accept building on land that has had factories, warehouses, car parks not farms as they are needed for food production.

Don't understand the difference between the two options, however, the less additional house, the better.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

I fundamentally do not believe that the projected housing need number is creditable

To minimise the amount of development in TMBC as infrastructure is already stretched to the limit.

The known significant planning developments of c6,000 that are already being considered or have passed planning, would allow for any current housing needs.

The infrastructure cannot support further overcrowding ; schools, doctors, schools and in particular traffic congestion

There is a limit to the number of dwellings that can be built due to the limited infrastructure which is already overstretched.

If a housing need has been assessed then why add a further buffer of 10% especially as tmcb has so little land available outside the green belt and doesn't have the "luxury" of over build.

I think that TMBC need to be very transparent about what they are aiming for. Are you working to meet the ongoing needs of an existing population, or building to attract more people to an area, the infrastructure of which is already struggling to deal with its current population? If you build houses, or course people will come and live in them, but there are plenty of

---

**User Response: Text**

other regions within the UK where population is far less dense than it already is in the South East. Resources are already stretched within our local area – water supplies, availability of doctors' appointments, the fact that at rush hour it takes 45 minutes to drive 5 miles to Sevenoaks railway station (and there is no commuter bus service available) to name but a few. Why exacerbate that situation with speculative development?

I think meeting housing need should be enough as there will almost certainly be some windfall sites in addition to those planned.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Local services are hugely overstretched already and the borough is overcrowded. All infrastructure is suffering, particularly local healthcare and education, with too many patients for medical practises, and pupils for the existing schools. Congestion on local roads deteriorates year on year. Reluctantly therefore, accepting option 1.

Why add 10%, when the assessed need is enough

A consequence of proposing higher housing numbers is potential development being proposed in areas outside of but close to the boundary of AONBs. This includes significantly expanding existing towns and villages and new settlements, such as the proposals put forward in the last iteration of the draft Local Plan at Borough Green and Eccles, both of which lie in the setting of the Kent Downs AONB. The Section 85 'Duty of Regard' in the 2000 CRoW Act requires all relevant authorities to have regard to the purpose of AONBs when coming to decisions or carrying out their activities relating to **or affecting** land within these areas. The PPG advises in respect of AONBs that "Land within the setting of these areas often makes an important contribution to maintaining their natural beauty, and where poorly located or designed development can do significant harm. This is especially the case where long views from or to the designated landscape are identified as important, or where the landscape character of land within and adjoining the designated area is complementary. Development within the settings of these areas will therefore need sensitive handling that takes these potential impacts into account" (Paragraph: 042 Reference ID: 8-042-20190721, revised 21 07 2019). The NPPF as amended now includes reference to development in the setting of AONBs, advising ' The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.'

Impacts will not just be confined to the visual or physical effects such as on habitats or watercourses connecting the AONB with its surroundings but will also add to the visitor numbers using the AONB and the traffic travelling through it, affecting the sense of naturalness, remoteness, tranquillity and dark skies.

Therefore, we consider that Quantum 2 would only be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that the numbers involved can be provided with no adverse impact to recognised constraints, including the AONB designation and its setting.

---

**User Response: Text**

The Council has continuously under-delivered as regards its housing supply for a number of years. By meeting its assessed housing need only puts at risk meeting this target as sites inevitably do not come forward as they are meant or expected to. Therefore, a buffer needs to be applied to allow for this circumstance.

Planning permission already granted must be taken into account

Tonbridge requires very small incidents on the roads for the to be gridlock and considerable congestion. The infrastructure now serves the maximum occupation.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Rather than building in contingency to the plan it should be kept fresh and regularly updated with the current view of housing needs. I would make the same point about the whole Local Plan. Any plan needs to evolve rather than being started from scratch every 10 years. I assume there is a demand forecasting process which is regularly repeated.

No point in exceeding assessed need which is already being met.

Infrastructure and services are not sufficient for large, proposed development.

Development in Borough Green will more than satisfy demand.

Housing built beyond the set-out need is surplus to requirement and unnecessarily risks the natural environment.

current identified target is challenging enough!

I don't agree with either, why is there no option for this???

The existing development plans are challenging and will have significant impact - TMBC should not plan for additional development beyond that which is necessary.

With the Government's current thinking of Levelling Up we should not be looking at building all over the southeast of England.

An extra 10% would put even more pressure on the already stretched Public services and would have an even greater environmental impact

---

**User Response: Text**

Changing environment. Assessed Housing Need is an informed guess. Best to use this as a best case but build in ability to flex either way.

The South East is full enough as it is.

Given the quantum government target for additional housing Option B is unrealistic. The current infrastructure does not meet the needs of the current population. Other agencies are responsible to deliver infrastructure and there is no guarantee that this will be achieved. There is also a lack of Brownfield sites.

Need by 2040 is ill defined. Stick to assessed housing need and no more

no option C

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Hildenborough area roads and vital services are already inadequate for the volume of traffic and population as are other areas in the borough. It will be difficult enough to cope with the assessed housing need let alone Option Quantum 2 unless full forward planning is undertaken regarding the infrastructure development.

Population growth is expected

I think we should do the minimum requested by Government as I feel there are significantly more opportunities to develop in areas in the UK with a lesser population density and better infrastructure which is not creaking as ours is locally.

The saturation of developments will have a negative effect on the quality of life for residents. There is also a real risk of a losing our rural heritage. Also, by using farmland, food production is lost.

I feel that option b would encourage greater movement from more expensive London boroughs and therefore would not necessarily help address local housing needs.

None of the above. The assessed need is already too high as it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and

---

**User Response: Text**

makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The assessed housing need is already accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have trailed behind release of planning permissions: this is normal and likely to continue in the current economic situation. The target figure has already been inflated by the government by 23%.

I think it is difficult for a borough like T&M to take on additional housing needs because of the large amount of ANOB and Greenbelt - housing needs do need to be met but additional housing is probably better accommodated in areas a bit further from London or within London. Sprawl where one place merges into another (and London sprawling out) can distort character of each local town as they get subsumed into generally built up commuter belt- T&M is lucky to have a certain character that is separate from a general London suburban conurbation and has preserved its own identity.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge

Meeting assessed needs should be specific and related to the ability to meet the needs of the community. Applying an in built 10% growth factor is not the best way to provide resilience for "unforeseen changes", rather it is recipe for potential unrequired development.

Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside the area of Outstanding Beauty.

The assessed housing need already accommodates unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind the release of planning permissions. This is traditional and is likely to continue with the current economic conditions. The government already add 23% to the assessed housing requirement.

It's important not to build more houses than are needed.



---

**User Response: Text**

We are only required to meet housing needs

I cannot agree with either option as I believe the government's overall assessment is tragically flawed.

We don't need more housing here with all the additional infrastructure that would be required that goes around it. Our schools and medical centres already can't cope, and the roads are already clogged. The recent closure of the A21 has caused absolute misery and chaos on the B245. Some of us aren't go out at the weekend as it took an age to make it back home.

I think Option A is already a significant increase. Plus this is an "assessed" increase, so we do not need to exceed our assessment if the assessment is correct, do we?

The targets are already very ambitious and will be difficult enough as it is to achieve, without setting even higher targets than currently assessed as being required.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

I think it likely that in the not too distant future any additional housing need might be met by conversion of unused retail and office premises as more shopping is online and more persons work from home.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

It will not be easy to find housing required in this borough

---

**User Response: Text**

As outlined in a previous comment, I do not understand how the Assessed Housing Need has been set at such a high figure relative to the current housing need and the population of the Borough. In addition the Assessed Housing Need already accommodates unused planning permissions. Given the work done on the Assessed Housing Need and the difficulties surrounding land development, adding a random 10% quantum would be unjustified and, frankly, bizarre.

I do not feel that 16,000 dwellings are necessary in the borough if 1200 households are on the waiting list, therefore it is unnecessary to add 10%

I think the assessed need is too high so reluctantly accept Option 1. It is based on out of date figures and makes no allowance for changes that have been brought about by Brexit and Covid. Already overcrowded, the additions will cause more stress on overstretched local services such as healthcare and education and even more congestion on the roads in and around Tonbridge.

It doesn't overburden the need to take green belt land and expand weak infrastructures.

We live in an already overcrowded corner of the country. Supply will never outstrip demand regardless of what figure is agreed, so by providing the option for +10%, this inevitably will be what happens. Aiming low and encouraging a "levelling up" across less overcrowded areas of the country sounds a more sensible strategy.

I'm sorry I don't understand the options - I just know that we don't need anymore incursion on our green spaces

The assessed need is already too high and makes no allowance for the changes of Brexit and Covid. The Borough is overcrowded and to increase it will over put stress on healthcare .and education services. Not to mention the additional congestion to Tonbridge roads.

With the current cost of living crisis, cuts in budgets across the board throughout government including spending on the NHS, withdrawal of funding of public transport like buses etc, surely the council should be considering the minimum requirements it will need to meet the housing needs of the borough. It's important that existing budgets are not overstretched by too many additional houses building built which means the infrastructures cannot cope with increased demand and no additional funding to be put into them.

The assessed housing need is already accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to the current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement

I believe that we are not that far away from saturation point, roads in the area are already subject to traffic road blocks each day. The Hadlow road is often backed up going into Tonbridge and also in the other direction at the roundabout to kings Hill, Wrotham and 7 mile Lane. Creating any significant increase in housing within this area will simply make the situation worse.

---

**User Response: Text**

Assessing housing need for the future is a 'black art'.

Adding 10% to this guesswork is pure madness.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

People from outside the area should find less encouragement to move in to Tonbridge and Malling, or indeed in to Kent.

We hope that 'Leveling Up' will make more people want to stay in their own local area, and leave room for those of us that belong locally here

As the assessed need already includes 23% added by the government, there seems no need to increase it. Also, I believe there are a number of developments currently in progress or recently completed that are not included.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorb CO2, provide wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic on roads that are already congested.

**User Response: Text**

The NPPF advises that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing when set against their housing requirement as established in their adopted Local Plans.

In our view, if the Council decides to pursue those development options which entails major urban extensions or a new settlement then we consider that the Council should be planning to meet their assessed housing need plus 10%. The reason for this is that larger complex developments take a lot longer to come to fruition because of complexities with land assembly, planning and infrastructure provision.

If, on the other hand, the Council decide to pursue a more dispersed strategy involving a range of sites in different locations then we believe that there would be an argument for only meeting the assessed housing need of 839 dwellings per annum

I dont believe building more houses will solve the problem of housing need. I am sceptical that housing supply and value are affected by the supply of new housng. I think interest rates, the state of the economy etc are more likely to solve the problem of lack of housing.

It's not that there aren't enough houses in the area, it's that people with big budgets are moving down from London and pricing locals out of the areas they grew up in. I cannot afford a house in the village I grew up in at all. Putting in more housing 'affordable' or otherwise, will still attract and assist city workers with larger budgets rather than the locals.

It's not about the number of homes, it's about affordability for local residents, many of whom rent and won't be able to buy these new houses anyway. So who exactly do these homes benefit, other than quota numbers?

If more houses were built in my childhood village of Hildenborough, I, a home owner and full time employee, still wouldn't have anywhere near enough to even buy a new build 2 bed. So again, who are these houses for?

Avoid Green & agricultural belt development, avoid harm biodiversity and more pressure on infrastructure.( roads , schools ,medical facilities as well).

Assessed needs seem very high so would like to see this as the absolute maximum (and ideally driving for a maximum below this)

We do not know how much we will need.

None of the options are ideal, but Option 1 would have the least negative effect. The figures quoted seem to be at least seven years out of date. Any additional large scale developments would put more stress on education, healthcare and more traffic on already busy roads.

There is already pressure for more and more development in the South East and I see no reason to add to that pressure

---

**User Response: Text**

The assessment of housing need at National and Regional Planning level is based on a wide range of factors, including economic growth forecasts, projections of birth and death rates and both in-and out-migration. The process inherently recognises that it is not a precise science, but it follows a well-rehearsed systematic analysis to come to a realistic target. There is therefore no need for the Council to add an arbitrary 10% of its own accord. To do so, is likely to amount to no more than an open invitation to neighbouring authorities to seek housing sites within their own boundaries with less rigour. "Over-provision" also has a cumulative effect, with the "extra" families adding to the natural demands for more space, larger houses, new houses for children of elderly parents, demands on schools and social services in future years.

Providing just the assessed housing need will have significant impact on borough, believe that should be set as the maximum

Not exceed levels needed

No response

Housing register requirements indicate that we do not need to build so many houses in and around Hildenborough

Reluctantly choosing Questions 1 i believe that the assessed need is already high. The borough is already overcrowded. It will put more stress on services that are fit to burst already.

The assessed housing need is the outcome of some Central Government mathematical formula which it could be argued has little consideration for local need. The idea of compounding a figure that seems to be plucked out of the air by a further 10% would be irresponsible.

The South East of England is already heavily populated.

housing number already almost unattainable

The government plan to force even more housing in Kent when the whole infrastructure is already overwhelmed and crumbling is wrong. Concreting over Kent is wrong. If we can't change the government plan to foist more houses on Kent then we shouldn't go beyond the bare minimum in their dictat.

In this area exceeding the assessed housing need would lead to further pressure on the infrastructure and land supply.

Option A is bad enough with 830/year required. This is 16000 dwellings to be added which is 29% uplift and will require significant additional built up area, as well as necessitate a comparable increase in infrastructure and services. As we know money is tight, we are under no illusion that the required investment will lag behind the planned provision, so as existing residents, the levels of development will be detrimental to our living conditions and cause additional stress. 10% in addition

---

**User Response: Text**

would be even less tollerable and unviable. The quantum is handed down by central government based on pre- Brexit and Covid projections for growth, which are not realistic. They also oversress the SE, rather than equally spreading the development across the whole country, and just add to the north south divide instead of levelling up. They do not address the actual local needs, which are based more on affordability, than the quantum of houses available.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The borough should certainly not seek to exceed the assessed housing need which is already excessive.

we need bare minimum of additional homes.

My preferred quantum option is **OPTION 3**

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

We should be building **only** for international migration, for affordable housing, for a sustainable amount of growth and/or replacing poor, existing housing.

Meeting the assessed housing need will be difficult enough without going beyond, if the character and scale of the area, its open spaces, green spaces, historic heritage is not to be negatively impacted as it is beginning to be at present. Coupled with stretched infrastucture, roads water supply, drainage flooding risk, reduced healthcare services, strained schools.... all that makes the area so desirable to live in.

Meeting assessed housing need should be sufficient and development restricted.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

The Borough will struggle to find enough houses for current needs

This is Hobson's Choice - you are presenting the appearance of choice without any real choice there at all. It's a bit like saying, would you like me to a) steal your car, or b) steal your car and punch you in the face? Obviously I'd choose a) but that doesn't remotely mean I think it's a good idea.

I don't agree that the assessed housing need is appropriate. The government has lots of options of lots of different areas to develop around the UK and constantly chosed to over populate and ruin the South of the country. There are lots of amazing

---

**User Response: Text**

opportunities near cities above London, such as Manchester, Birmingham etc. It is no longer all about London. Development should be UK wide, not just over populating the South but trying to invest in the North also.

Development in this country is over-concentrated on the south-east - development should be encouraged where possible in areas that need, to use the Govt buzzword "levelling up".

15941 is quite enough and will bring great pressures on infrastructure and amenities/ health services and education with the number of people and their cars this figure will entail

Even Option A I consider excessive

Out of the Options given, Option A is the preferred option as the Assessed Housing Need already is +/-10% of needs.

Given that the borough has had additional dwellings numbers imposed on it by Government due to a lack of an approved Local Plan, and the overall agenda to "Levelling Up", I believe TMBC should be looking to reduce the number of dwellings built, and put political pressure on government to get the outdated Assessed Housing Need calculations changed.

It will be difficult to find housing needed in this borough

No response

Traffic within the borough is already congested at peak times and the road network doesn't appear to have the capacity to expand with the housing numbers (based solely on my opinion).

If this is a government assessed housing need, do local authorities have the right to question it? This area of the south-east already lacks the necessary facilities in terms of schools, medical and dental practices. Increasing the housing density will simply compound the problem. Transport is over-stretched currently, and roads are becoming dangerously busy.

CPRE Kent would like to see a third option of not meeting the full housing requirement being explored, to reflect the fact that:

- (a) the standard methodology calculation is flawed – it creates a scenario that addresses housing demand, rather than need
- (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
- (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

It should be noted that the SA confirms that of the two quantum options meeting assessed need (only) performs best in terms of the sustainability objectives.

---

**User Response: Text**

I really want quantum 3 but you haven't given me that option

History has shown us that aspirations for housing development are never achieved in reality and thus it would be more sensible to base the plan on the assessed housing need which will be a significant challenge in itself.

It's difficult to find the houses required in this Borough

At a local meeting on this planning decision it was noted that there are currently 1500 people awaiting social housing. The current target of 16k new homes far exceeds the needs of the local population so it makes no sense to then add an additional 10%

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

It can be a challenge to predict the future. It makes sense to build in some prepared resilience should additional housing be needed (but not to build additional houses where neighbouring authorities do not meet their targets).

No Comment

Housing need will already put pressure on infrastructure, public services and greenfield land.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Building on land to attract people who have house elsewhere is a waste of land and needless destruction.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Local services are already stretched. It would require additional facilities to be build . Additional housing will make problems from global warming more difficult to ameliorate .



---

**User Response: Text**

Reluctantly accepting option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high - it is based on out of date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

I would have no objection to the plus 10% if development was on brownfield sites but I fear this is not on TMBC agenda therefore object to anything more.

We understand that the assessed housing need already accommodates unused planning permissions (and completions are expected to continue to run behind the release of planning permissions).

Furthermore, we are informed that the assessed housing need has already had 23% added to it by dint of a Government requirement.

Impact should be minimised

I do not believe Kings Hill should be included in expansion plans given that it has taken 58% of the total development of the borough.

Whilst I understand the need for housing in these areas, especially in times where housing is in short supply, I must express my concerns about where/how this additional housing will be built, and the lack of any actual planning behind the construction of said housing. Constraints on road access, and lack of both public services and facilities on these new estates must be taken into account. For example, the Leybourne Chase Estate (which had planning permission granted in 2004, had construction start in the early-mid 2010's, and was intended to have it's own GP surgery in 2016) only had a single shop open within the last year or so, with other public facilities only opening up in more recent times. I have concerns that the lack of facilities to these new estates, as well as lack of easy access to public transport like in more established estates may cause problems for the future growth and development of these areas.

need housing but on restricted basis

- already consider the quantum to be a stretch on the borough to absorb, the target in itself could increase the size of dwellings in the borough by a third in just 16 years, feels like a rapid scale of development

Increasing housing will increase population rather than responding to an existing need.

---

**User Response: Text**

None of these. Please leave alone.

Local services especially healthcare and education cannot deal with existing demand. any more than the assesses need will cripple services in the borough.

See above. Again, I think the intent is to obtain a conclusion that 'the majority of Tonbridge & Malling residents prefer to meet the Assessed Housing Need' i.e. for substantial growth of the housing stock. I DO NOT agree with either of these 'quantum options' and I believe that that the majority of Tonbridge & Malling residents are AGAINST the substantial growth in housing set out in both options A and B.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded.

Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO<sub>2</sub>, provides wildlife habits. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt.

Our Prime Minister, Rishi Sunak's tweeted during his campaign to promise to reduce the annual house building target of 300,000 p.a., and to not allow building on the Green Belt.

This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government, so any increase on this figure is unnecessary.

Option 1 of two bad choices, the assessed need is out-of-date & too high. It is based on pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. In addition the Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Demand for housing is going to fall if, it has not already. The data used to calculate this 'need' is very old and needs to be challenged. The South East is already overpopulated and this 'need' should be spread more to other parts of the country.

I am in favour of fewer houses to avoid an urban sprawl

---

**User Response: Text**

no comment

To avoid additional harm to the Green Belt, biodiversity, and pressure on infrastructure - particularly on roads in the Borough that are already congested, but also pressure on schools and medical facilities. Also, agree with TMBC's assessment that there are likely to be more negative outcomes from Option B.

I assume the need was assessed correctly and therefore why would you need a 10% cushion?

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out of date (pre-2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit & COVID since then. Without accurate data there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wet land and green belt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skillful and high quality developments and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving green belt and wetlands. Additionally due to Tonbridges geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic which is already congested.

At this point in time I see no justification to build more than the minimum requirement as this will only prolong the building process and encourage more people to the area which is already becoming overpopulated with respect to what the borough has to offer other than cheaper housing than London primarily for commuters. The borough has some significant natural beauty which is already being lost through significant housing developments.

Local plan should allow to only meet the projected housing need, in order to protect greenfield, Greenbelt and open spaces

Building new homes in a sustainable way will take time and must balance the need for housing with the need to maintain our beautiful county and therefore we must strive at best to meet the government target whilst also meeting our environmental target to limit new houses.

Option A is preferred. If option B was chosen and other neighbouring boroughs went with option A, greater housing capacity (+10%) in Tonbridge and Malling could lead to a reliance on our borough to house the growing population of other boroughs.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high - it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already over overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge

The south is already overpopulated, we should build the bare minimum.

There are, according to CPRE, more than sufficient brown field sites in the UK to provide for short, and medium, term housing needs across the country. Forced development of productive farmland and other green spaces enjoyed by the

---

**User Response: Text**

residents of the borough flies in the face of stated government policy to prioritise brown field sites for future development.

There is little room for more housing as it is, with the existing infrastructure. There is already quite a high imbalance between the number of inhabitants and services such as health (GPs, dentists etc.) and also sports and leisure. For example there is no major sports and leisure centre offering a multitude of sports like, for example, the one in Surrey, near Guildford (Guildford Spectrum). More housing means more people putting pressure on the already meagre offering of sports centres in the borough.

So as not to lose greenbelt land, and put added pressure on already gridlocked roads.

A Borough housing need assessment may be lower than the Government requirements of 16,000 housing units and the Borough quantum should apply. Government imposed targets and Option B are likely to attract higher numbers from outside the Borough, particularly new commuters, exacerbating building density and transportation problems, particularly access to trains, and developments may not be a good fit for the assessed future needs of existing Borough residents particularly for the rising local need for affordable homes; housing for the aged or for particular needs. These categories particularly need to be near the Service Centres where land is already difficult.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Adding an arbitrary 10% to a calculated figure of need seems wrong. It is likely to lead to land being offered for development that may not be required.

I have not selected any

I have no choice as i dont support either - push back as we dont have the space for these houses.

I selected Quantum 1 as I see no reason to exceed the onerous housing targets set by the current government in the South East

If the Government pursues it's levelling up agenda and creates opportunities in Northern England, pressure for housing in the South East should ease. Many people in the South East are economic migrants, chasing jobs that historically were always located here.

There is no justification for elevated levels of development

---

**User Response: Text**

We will struggle to find enough houses for current needs which is questionable

we will struggle to find enough houses for current needs which is questionable

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have to run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Why increase the number of houses when there is already stress on the system?

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the Government requirement.

6,000 home is a 28% increase on the existing number of dwellings in the borough. Even more would create unsustainable need for facilities.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high - it is based on out of date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

It will already be difficult to find the houses required in this borough and improve the infrastructure to accommodate additional stress placed on it by additional housing.

Most development should be away from the south-east with genuine levelling-up.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have to run behind

---

**User Response: Text**

release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

To minimise the amount of development.

The target is already onerous to meet, there is no need to exceed it.

Finding even 10% more would be an increasingly difficult step, so I would prefer the focus to be on assessed need itself. A 10% increase would overload existing services in health and education particularly. It would create a higher land take especially of green field sites and such strategy would risk breaching the green belt even more than the current proposal will. there would be greater traffic congestion and overall a more negative effect on climate change.

We have NOT selected a quantum option because We believe that further distinct quantum options need to be identified given Housing Market Areas exert an influence across the borough and that neighbouring authorities are facing similar challenges to addressing their assessed needs.

To maintain quality of life, physical & mental health of borough residents in Tonbridge & Malling, across Kent & save areas currently in decline such as Tonbridge - urban areas need to be the focus to get people to help with regeneration rather than adding to transport quadmire & causing gridlock.

Best use of finite brown field land for denser dwellings should be promoted by the Council as oppose to wide spread executive housing (that benefits developers profits?).

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

No reason to exceed the existing assessed housing need.

It will be difficult to find the houses required in this borough let alone more!

The infrastructure must be improved before any significant housing development takes place

This is a forced choice because the plan is using very dated population figures prior to 2014. As such, it does not take into account significant changes in recent years as a result of Brexit and Covid. Without up-to-date, accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that currently absorbs carbon dioxide, provides habitation for wildlife and crucially prevents the town from flooding. Sympathetic and considered development along with refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing whilst preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Furthermore, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already severely congested.

---

**User Response: Text**

I believe that the expected increase in population figures is grossly overestimated and that focus should be given to trying to educate the population to reduce population increase as the economical, environmental and infrastructure resources are not available to support future large increases in population growth. We should not be actively trying to encourage population migration from other parts of the country into T&MC as we are currently unable to support the residential numbers that we currently have.

Neither are appropriate here, the demand of the plan far exceeds that which will not harm the environment and quality of life of current residents. If housing needs are met the infrastructure of the Boro will fail to cope.

Only minimum development

It will change the area dramatically.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO<sub>2</sub>, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and Option A Quantum 1 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need Option B Quantum 2 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need + up to 10% wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic which is already congested.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures.

It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO<sub>2</sub>, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding.

Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

For example during rush hour the queues from the intersection with the Shipbourne Road and the High Street already tail back to Dry Hill Road and this will only cause further congestion backing up through the village and Shipbourne Road causing more pollution and for the local residents and school children. Over 450 children live during term time in the boarding houses on these main roads and they will be directly affected by the pollution caused by any increase in traffic in the North Tonbridge/ South Hildenborough area. The adverse health effects of such pollution on children and the links to asthma are well documented. As well as Tonbridge boarding school there are 2 primary schools on Dry Hill Road which will also be affected by pollution should traffic increase.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO<sub>2</sub>, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing

---

**User Response: Text**

while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

The requirement of housing can change with government plans and the argument should be made for a lower amount of housing in this area. Areas that have not made significant housing developments (Like Sevenoaks Council) should be working to make up shortfalls from previous building plans.

To reduce the quantum of development in the district as far as possible to protect the environment, air quality and quality of life for existing residents. Due to the large proportion of greenbelt the amount of development should be kept to a minimum. Additional pressure on infrastructure would limit the quantum of development such as the highway network which is proven to be over capacity at key locations.

Don't see the need in going beyond the assessed housing need

The housing needs are not as stated but are government controlled numbers, the borough has a number of empty large buildings which could be converted into flats making them affordable first time properties but this option is not one that TMBC seem to regard as practicable.

- Reluctantly accepting Option 1 , I believe that the assessed need is already too high - it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The target is already in excess of the needs of the area, its the lessor of the two evils

Development in this Rural area should only be replacement for building that have been demolished.

Quantum 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration" as this is a bottomless pit. We are mainly rural villages in Greenbelt land, the local plan is not fit for purpose. Build in other areas on brownfield sites, it's well known that developers try to push for development on Greenbelt because they make more profit. We must not allow this.

I personally believe the Government targets for the housing developments in the area and in the South East are ludicrously high. While I understand the need for local people to be able to buy houses, and support that aim, I also believe the country should be and could be doing more to honour the levelling up pledges for other parts of the country, building more houses and creating jobs away from the South East so that we wouldn't need to keep building so many homes here.

Also, we need to ensure houses built in the area are affordable for those local people and not the five bed executive homes that have been built in the area in recent years that typically cost circa £900k plus.



---

**User Response: Text**

Housing needs can be met in many ways, not just new developments.

In TMBC there is significant under occupation because of a poor mix of housing stock.

It will be a struggle to achieve even this.

The assessed housing need is, in all probability, wrong. The government methodology for calculating housing need was changed 12-18 months ago and it is far from certain that the government target for TMBC is correct.

We should always plan for the worst case whilst aiming for the best case or less!

With greater use of working from home/digitally, I believe TMBC will experience less demand on its housing in the future, as people can live further from London but still be employed by London-based organisations. People will be able to migrate to cheaper areas further from the capital.

There is a fundamental question about the validity of the need 15941 dwellings over the period. This appears to be a generic formula rather than local specific.

Simplistic calculations based on your figures show that the 15941 represents 28.4% growth over current levels of homes (56096). The populations growth is forecast to be 14% (132k to 152k). While there may currently be some shortfall to also meet - it seems excessive to suggest that the growth in dwellings required is double the growth in population anticipated.

There appears to be no consideration to potential long term implications of changes in lifestyle and ways of working post covid. While I appreciate this is still unclear it is apparent we are in a paradigm shift that could have a major impact.

The Sustainability report demonstrates that there are very few positive benefits and a significant number of negative implications from both the overall and the individual site assessments - beyond simply meeting the goal of having more houses.

We need to be more innovative in our approach to the challenge than simply saying only answer is to build more homes.

The Assessed Housing Need is currently accommodating unused planning permissions. Current economic conditions suggest completions will continue to run behind release of planning provisions. 23% is already added to the Assessed Housing Need by the government requirement.

Frankly, the requirements of option 1 are too high.

With reservation option 1 . It is generally believed the assessed need is already too high based on outdated 2014 population figures , not taking into account the effects of Brexit and covid . We are already overcrowded and this will further stretch health care (try getting a dentist appointment ) and education . Not to forget the additional conjection which will result .

---

**User Response: Text**

Please ensure you make a very careful assessment of housing need with a focus upon housing for lower income families and single people. It seems pointless to me to add 10% to a figure that is based upon educated guesswork. Also it would be an environmental disaster to build houses that were not needed and that would stand empty. A situation that I believe has occurred in the USA and Ireland.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Flexibility

Is the housing needs assessment accurate - it seems a lot of houses are "required" and it will be difficult to meet the current target without affecting TMBC let alone plus 10%

Quantum 1 is more than enough houses in this area and it needs to be exactly that and "assessed" for the relevant needs of the area.

Option A – meeting Assessed Housing Need

It's realistic

As your brochure suggests, if there is more housing supply in the borough then the prices for these dwellings will decrease and make a home affordable for those who live and work locally (and don't commute to London)

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and

---

**User Response: Text**

greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Thoughtful, high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested. I am also very concerned about the capacity of our water infrastructure to cope with additional sites.

839 homes per year will have a significant impact on the borough. I don't feel it is appropriate to add further development in the coming years to go beyond the housing need assessment as this will detrimentally affect many aspects of borough life.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

If stick to plan quota, then focus can be made on ensuring new houses up to optimal standard; corners will not be cut to fill extra 10%.

No not want to build any more than truly needed - including some affordable housing please

I have not answered question 5 because the answer I wish to give is for TMBC to reassess the housing need by reference to the people who live or need to live in TMBC, not on the basis of central government diktat. Forcing unreasonable numbers of houses on Borough and District councils is the wrong way to improve housing provision. It usually results in houses nobody wants because they are in the wrong places and have the wrong mix of housing types and tenures. Decisions of this sort should be made locally with local data to ensure that the houses built are actually needed.

The SA has many assumptions and unknowns. The additional burdens of B seem too risky for limited defined benefit. Major concerning of overwhelming already overwhelmed services in some areas

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the Government requirement.

question 5 is restrictive

---

**User Response: Text**

It is essential that TMBC seeks to address local housing needs and by providing a buffer of around 10% this will reflect the intentions of the NPPF to boost housing supply. Furthermore, there are many neighbouring authorities who have not progressed an up to date plan and as a result are not providing sufficient housing to meet local needs in their area. an additional buffer will ensure that some of these needs can be met and help to ensure affordability and choice of homes throughout the borough. It is important that a range of housing sites are allocated to enable the delivery of homes at all stages of the plan period, and smaller sites such as Land east of Bull Lane, Eccles (SA ref 59831) can provide a good opportunity for potential early housing delivery.

In my opinion, neither is correct. Housing should be for replacing poor housing, repairing unused buildings and using brown field sites for affordable housing.

That target is quite challenging enough.

The Standard Method for Calculating Housing Need (the Standard Method) sets a minimum housing requirement to accommodate growth. It is not a limit on the quantum of development that could be planned for over the Plan Period. To plan positively for growth, particularly in light of past failures to deliver sufficient housing to meet needs which have resulted in unplanned windfall development on greenfield land, a 10% buffer should be included as a minimum to the quantum of development to be delivered over the Plan Period.

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council is consulting on the proposal to alter Green Belt boundaries to accommodate housing need over the Plan Period. The NPPF (section 13) is clear that in redefining Green Belt Boundaries policies need to take account of longer term needs which extend beyond the Plan Period in order that revised Green Belt boundaries can be maintained. It is therefore important that the Council plans for needs beyond the minimum requirements detailed in the Standard Method which should be for a minimum of 10% addition to ensure there is no requirement to further change the Green Belt boundaries after the next Plan Period.

There will always be 'creep' and the start point should be the minimum to avoid excessive destruction of communities, wildlife and habitat.

It will be a challenge to meet the assessed housing need given the restrictions on development due to the green belt and AONB

unused planning consents are included in the assessment.

Development always runs behind consents. If current lack of finance opprtunities at acceptable levels of interest continue housing development will be very slow.

Who assesses the housing need?

we need our countryside for our future generations

---

**User Response: Text**

.

why go beyond the existing need when the infrastructure is not there for existing residents let alone new ones.

Additional housing planned now in appropriate urban locations should help to attract urban investment in relevant services in advance of the required need.  
such an approach should also help to manage inappropriate development requests in green belt/protected areas and ensure these are not granted permission.

I do not see why an additional 10% should be built, we should build to the quota required only. From previous data we should be able to plan strategically the number of houses required. By building above this quota it will leave many properties empty and the council will miss out on valuable funds such as council tax.

There are already planning permissions that are unused or are running late, and these will fill part of the gap.

I support neither because both envisage Kings Hill expanding exponentially further with no proper examination of other areas in the borough.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

The Borough is predominantly rural and I'd like to keep it that way. I feel development should be limited to the minimum strictly necessary to meet local needs - not to allow others from other areas to relocate.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge. Also, flooding and increased pollution.

It would be good to meet the known need where there has just been failure in the past. The current demand from the government is quite enough without exceeding that level.

---

**User Response: Text**

The assessed housing need is already accommodating unused planning permissions. completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

as in q5

option B adds more stress on the need to find land to build on

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Further houses should be built to help the government's levelling up agenda - in counties in the north or west of England - NOT in the South East.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Reluctantly option 1. The borough is already overcrowded and resources over stressed.

The assessed housing need is already accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

---

**User Response: Text**

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Need to aim for flexibility in the future.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and Option A Quantum 1 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need Option B Quantum 2 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need + up to 10% wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

The assessed housing need is already accommodated through unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

I'm not clear that the housing need has been properly assessed or whose need it is supposed to be meeting. It is based on out of date (pre-2014) population figures which take no account of Brexit and COVID. Yet the impact on our town and borough could be adverse and far reaching, with homes we don't need or that may not be built sustainably encroaching on

---

**User Response: Text**

valuable areas such as woodland which have an important role in absorbing CO2. Our wetlands and greenbelt are also critical for wildlife. We have had a huge decline in species in the UK - 41% according to the The State of Nature 2019 report. That is a shocking figure. Yes, people need homes but these need to be the right homes in the right places with a supportive infrastructure. Tonbridge's roads are already congested and its geography limits the building of additional ones.

There us far too much hosing in the south east, much more than in other parts of the country

I do not think any more houses than necessary should be built in the South East of England. Levelling up can only be achieved by building further North and West.

I consider the definition of "assessed need " to already be excessive given falling birthrates and falling immigration, Brexit, covid and the fact that out of date figures have been used.

House prices are unlikely to be positively affected (for buyers) by new development so should not be a consideration.

Extra housing only seems to benefit the building firms at the expense of borough residents and green space.

Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and highquality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownSeld areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, with roads that are already operating at and beyond capacity causing increased pollution.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

I think it is entirely reasonable for the Local Plan to Meet Assessed Housing Need and not provision for 10% more at this stage, e.g. for a contingency.

I consider that a more sensible time to review the assessment of housing need will be at the next update of the Local Plan. I would not expect the Assessed Housing Need to be fully delivered within a 5 year timeframe, given that an overarching Vision for 2040 is what is being outlined. I would expect a review of the Housing Need Assessment to be done within 5 years, taking account of any changes in housing stock and an updated view of user needs in the interim ( 5 year) period.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and Option A Quantum 1 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need Option B Quantum 2 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need + up to 10% wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build



**User Response: Text**

additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

As few new housing developments as possible.

Unused planning permissions are already incorporated in the assessed housing need. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

I chose Neither.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by government requirement.

Our area is already overcrowded and further development of the Grange Farm and Greentrees area will worsen traffic congestion, car parking and the demand on local services.

We really need to better develop existing housing and include smaller developed / sub-divides into the total housing need

The targets are already too high. Looking to add further to quantum by 10% will increase pressure on local communities even further. Increased land requirements, increased pressure on green belt and AONBs; greater traffic congestion, climate change pressure; increased pressure on main infrastructure - power networks, sewers; increased risk of water poverty, Pressure on health, education and retail services. Clearly an unacceptable level of harm would result.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Option A Quantum 1 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need

Option B Quantum 2 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need + up to 10%

**Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.**

We need to plan and design any new building works carefully and thoughtfully, with regards to the nature of existing settlements and the environment. Unnecessary over-development should not be built in to any plan.

As stated above in Q4.

---

**User Response: Text**

If there is to be major development in the area, then it would make sense to build an additional number of houses if the land is available to future proof our housing stock.

Assessed housing need is already accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions run behind planning permissions, which is not likely to change in the present economic circumstances.

I am not in favour at all of any changes and therefore I am not answering question 5.

Quantum 1 as the housing targets are onerous enough without a further percentage.

Option B has more negative outcomes and would put more pressure on the Green Belt and local infrastructure

The borough does not have the infrastructure to support any more than the minimum.

TMBC is already overpopulated and has inadequate infrastructure if the AONB and Green Belt are respected as they should be . Expansion should be as limited as possible consistent with legal obligations

TMBC is a largely rural authority and yet the draft plan includes a disproportionate amount of suggested potential development sites beyond the urban centres some of which would encroach upon greenbelt and burden already overstretched public services and infrastructure. Development and housing provision obligation should be directed to and shared with other authorities with larger established populations

To ensure that we plan for the future

Option A is preferred. If option B was chosen and other neighbouring boroughs went with option A, greater housing capacity (+10%) in Tonbridge and Malling could lead to a reliance on our borough to house the growing population of other boroughs.

Local facilities and structures are struggling to cope with the population we have now. Until this is sorted, the luxury of developing for future need can't be included. That doesn't mean that it shouldn't happen organically across the time frame set out here and local planning decisions should be mindful of this.

It's realistic.

---

**User Response: Text**

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

It is a shame there is not the option of rejecting the spatial strategy entirely, which would be my preferred choice. The South East already over-developed and over-populated.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

The Government number of 15,941 new homes within the boundaries of Tonbridge and Malling up to 2040 is too great. The requirement set by the Government should be challenged and with this in mind we should only be planning to meet the assessed need.

It's realistic

It's the realistic approach.

Question 5 is a "least-worst" scenario! To garner the actual opinions of existing residents, this questionnaire should ask whether we should completely reject the government's target as unrealistic and totally unachievable.

Kings Hill has already been over-developed and my understanding is that the original plan required a certain percentage of the land to be retained for sporting amenities and brown field sites. Please do not renege on this original agreement.

Additionally, Watlington cannot do not need any more traffic!

Why have an extra 10%, who is that going to benefit but the developers.

Tonbridge is already congested and due to its geography, it's not possible to build additional road infrastructure.

The south east of England continues to draw people from around the country as the Government's levelling up program is not delivering. If the council wants to meet the needs of the local community but not put in protections for local community members then they must add capacity for people moving from elsewhere.

---

**User Response: Text**

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The data being used by the plan is out of date as it comes from before 2014 and several things have changed since then including Brexit and Covid which have impacted the way people live and their priorities

Why build in excess of the need, based on old data possibly leading to unnecessary development with all the likely negatives this entails in terms of pollution and congestion.

The quota set by government is already unrealistic

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Many of the premises used for the second option are likely to be proved incorrect.

The borough is in need of increased quantum as a whole.

Population projections are likely to be unreliable and the data is outdated.

This is why local consultation is important. Assessing housing need sounds like some discredited central planning philosophy which sets unrealistic or unachievable targets which are in no-one's interest.

Neither of the options are appropriate and the council should be aiming for meeting the assessed housing need plus 20%.

---

**User Response: Text**

This would be in line with NPPF para 74 'maintaining supply and delivery of housing'. The councils Housing Land Supply position statement 2021 identifies at para 4.1 that the council currently has a 3.17 year supply of housing and at para 2.4 states that '*As a consequence of this HDT measurement, a 20% buffer must be applied to the housing need for the five-year period 2021-2026. This means the need against which the projected supply is assessed increases from 4,195 dwellings to 5,034 dwellings*'. This 20% buffer should be applied to the housing needs identified within the local plan to ensure delivery within the early part of the plan, this should be as a minimum for the first 5 years, given the shortfall of housing delivery currently and that this shortfall is likely to continue for the next few years given that the existing adopted Core Strategy only met the timescale from 2007-2021.

the assessed housing need is the key calculator for working out the housing need, so developing over the assessed need will have detrimental effect on future housing numbers

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilfully designed and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, our town centre is already massively congested.

I believe we should focus on meeting the needs, rather than adding additional housing based on a speculative estimation.

Do the minimum to meet the need and, as the need was based on potentially out of date assessments (e.g. preBrexit), there will be the opportunity to review

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Don't believe the current need is an accurate representation and we shouldn't be using land to build houses to attract buyers who have houses elsewhere so I don't agree with either option A or option B

You have only given two options hence my answer. I would like to know who are you building the houses for? Where are the people coming from? Is the data/ are the figures from the Office of National Statistics who I have been informed have used incorrect modelling in the past. What is the ratio of existing commercial property to residential property in the areas specified on the plans? Can we not repurpose empty commercial property ie build on existing footprints? Thereby retaining our valuable and much-needed rural areas.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014

---

**User Response: Text**

population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Housing affordability is clearly a significant issue for the Borough with the property price to earnings ratio sitting at 13.4 in 2021, compared to 11.6 in the southeast and 9.1 nationally. Consequently, if the Council is to increase supply in order to help tackle the housing crisis then it needs to plan for above just meeting the minimum housing need identified by the standard methodology.

Indeed, an uplift of other levels over 10% should also be considered as reasonable alternatives.

Medway Council supports the objective of meeting OAN - notes option A and B - but is not putting a preference forward as to whether up to an extra 10% is required. Could we ask for clarification that the 10% extra is not meant as the 'buffer' beyond LHN in the event some sites do not come forward.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and highquality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Not enough information here.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Option B is purely speculative. We need to limit the impact of building development and contain it outside of the Greenbelt to protect the environment and live within the support resources available to us. Overdevelopment will just create more

---

**User Response: Text**

problems, increase risks from flooding, power 'brownouts', and further stretch and dilute essential requirements such as schools, hospitals, sewage, water supply, energy supply etc.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and highquality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

With Green Belt considerations in mind, the borough is not a location that should bear more housing than necessary.

The population figures are out of date (2014) and as such doesn't take into account recent developments from Brexit and the Covid pandemic.

You can't manage what you can't measure and without the correct data this could lead to unnecessary developments that compound the pre existing issues of flooding in Tonbridge, and without the space to develop the necessary supporting infrastructure such as roads it could worsen the already increasing traffic issues.

This is a choice being forced upon the area and although I understand some growth is necessary, I do not believe the quantity being driven is currently sufficient to current population expectations. Also, as mentioned before my primary drive is securing the local ecosystems from the damage development inherently inflicts.

Quantum 1 has more than enough houses in this area. and it needs to be exactly that and assessed for the relevant needs of the area. Development should be outside of the Greenbelt. Once the greenbelt is developed it is gone forever. PLEASE DON'T DO THIS. lets retain the uniqueness of our village and not lose our villages identity by proposing to join up with other villages.

How has the assessed need for housing within the borough has been arrived at? Does this take demographic trends into account and consider the relatively recent impact of Brexit and Covid?

Rather than solely relying on an assessed need being met by conventional housing models, a housing strategy needs to include the needs of everyone in the community, including the provision for elderly accomodation.

A new generation of high-quality, carefully thought through third-age housing options would inspire older people to depart from the norm and 'right-size', which, in turn, would free up the housing chain for younger home buyers in established locations, helping to address the chronic housing supply shortage we face. Currently, we have more than five million homes in the UK that are under-occupied and nearly half of all people over the age of 75 live alone. While many older homeowners consider downsizing, very few are enticed to do so.

The cascade of benefits to users and the wider community that flow from a new generation of well-designed specialist housing for older people are wide reaching: improving lives, encouraging residents to be socially and physically active, helping to pool services where they are needed most, and mitigating pressure on the NHS and local authorities. To read more about this see thisarticle in Architecture Today: 'Third Age Housing'

---

**User Response: Text**

<https://architecturetoday.co.uk/third-age-housing/>

The requirement already seems in excess of the actual need within this location. Market conditions mean that affordable housing is not best located in the south east. There is insufficient infrastructure to support the level of housing. Once the greenbelt is gone it will be irreversible.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit.

The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Please push back the HM Government on this - Quantum 1 is too high to start with

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

At our members meeting there was much debate about the number of 15,941 from the Government to plan for new homes within the boundaries of Tonbridge and Malling up to 2040. Leader of TMBC, Matt Boughton believes this number to be too high and is actively challenging it alongside MP Tom Tugendhat. We understand that there are approx. 1500 families on the housing register across the borough which suggests a need for homes exists but not to the scale set by the Government.

With Green Belt considerations in mind, the Borough is not a location that should bear more housing than necessary.

The country is facing a financial crisis at the moment and must keep within its means.

Because we are already being asked to provide an unsustainable amount of new housing in the borough



---

**User Response: Text**

Only supply new housing for the young and low paid.

This must be proven by their job

No second home owners or million pound properties offered to the rich please.

The low paid and young have been priced out of this area and that is not fair.

839 dwellings per annum or 15,941 dwellings (gross) across the plan period up to 2040 is more than enough as currently the infrastructure is insufficient and I doubt it will grow sufficiently to support the developments. Are Tonbridge and Malling having to provide additional housing due to the previous local plan being thrown out. Also, we should not have to increase the numbers if a neighbouring council (Sevenoaks) cannot provide the required number of dwellings and the government need to consider this

I would rather not over build in Hildenborough but happy to meet housing need

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge

Green spaces are so important to protect, and I feel that if there is any building developments, then these are lost forever. Therefore, it seems sensible to continue the successful redevelopment of brownfield spaces and ex-industrial sites and/or to change the use of existing buildings, in order to ensure that these green spaces are protected. The opportunity to escape to natural spaces proved essential since the start of the Covid pandemic. It feels that priority should be maintained on re-purposing existing building and the redevelopment of commercial and/or retail spaces for housing should be prioritised, over building any new homes on greenfield.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

As a young family living in the local area, I have to drive to my children's school. The lack of infrastructure already in place has resulted in not being able to get a place at the primary school within a very short walking distance. The traffic along Brook Street and Lower Haysden Lane is already unacceptable, a neighbour of ours had to give birth alone in her home due to the midwife being stuck in standstill traffic on this road during school hours. Adding further households to this area just seems completely unrealistic.

Quantum 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"

---

**User Response: Text**

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out of date (pre 2014) population figures. This could cause unnecessary development.

Due to Tonbridge geography, it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure, Tonbridge is already over congested.

The South East is already heavily populated.

Why take another 10% when the assessed need already has a buffer?

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the Government requirement.

I think empty properties have been completely overlooked. Could more of the housing need be met if the council were to purchase empty properties and develop these?

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions completions have run behind release of planning permissions and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions, 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Because Option B risks overcrowding and over development of existing overstretched settlements, while option A minimises that. Essentially, our island of Great Britain is over populated - migration will be a natural consequence.

To keep development to a responsible level.

Lack of Brownfield sites and lack of infrastructure to meet needs of existing population.

The housing needs are already quite challenging so no point in adding to them.

After Brexit there are reports that the housing need is not as high as originally calculated

Question 5 is also fundamentally flawed. See answer to question 2.

---

**User Response: Text**

I don't believe we need as many houses as we are being told we have to build let alone 10% more

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habitats and prevents the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to the geography of Tonbridge it is not suitable to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

The South East is already over populated and the North of England needs more jobs and more housing, not the rich south east.

I believe that the starting figure of homes needed is currently less than stated as the figures are two years out of date, during this period many developments and new home have been provided in the Borough.

I believe that reuse of now redundant office accommodation, which has been released due to remote working for residential purposes will, over time solution a significant amount of housing requirements, therefore preventing the need to over deliver on the frankly unreasonable government targets.

Actual need cannot be known with any degree of accuracy, so better to update the plan at, say, 5 yearly intervals.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

ri would not want to see an increase of uoto 10+

Given the strain on infrastructure such as schools and medical facilities that is currently the case, certainly in Hildenborough, I consider that the Assessed Housing Need is already very high for the area. There is a desperate need for affordable housing but I doubt that it would be possible to build enough to bring general prices down unless the area was made so unattractive that people would not want to live here.

There is a need to think through the mix of types of development though. I understand there is currently a real problem with 'retirement' flats where there is little demand and excess supply and I have a friend who has been trying to sell a flat in Tonbridge for many months and is desperate enough to consider giving it away.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population Sgures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and

---

**User Response: Text**

high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

The requirement of delivering 839 dpa should be clearly recognised as a minimum requirement as set out at paragraph 11b of the NPPF which states, "*strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing*".

Thus, in ensuring the 839 dpa or indeed 923 dpa is a minimum (+10%), this will provide the basis to allow affordability to improve across the Borough which currently sits at 13.39 (property price to earnings ratio). The Council therefore needs to do everything it can to ensure the target used is the minimum and that there is "*a sufficient supply and mix of sites*" (NPPF, paragraph 68) allocated which are deliverable across the Plan period to improve affordability. This is vital.

We do not need to have more than needed and we are limited on space already

Kings Hill is already over developed. The original approval was that 40% of the area should remain green space and within confines of brownfield space within the airfield. Why is this not being honoured?

These options are not fair there should be other options.

This is a forced choice and actually I feel less than this is required because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then with far less immigration, plus a recession on the horizon. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield sites areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and

I do not agree with either options above and I think you may have removed a third option from your list.

I choose Quantum 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

We believe that attaining the current Assessed Housing Need will probably prove to be a challenge and that until that can be clearly achieved within the Local Plan any work for Option B would be a distraction. We have heard of some instanced

---

**User Response: Text**

where the validity of some of the figures produced as a future housing requirement have been challenged and been found to be wildly inaccurate. We have no knowledge about how they are formulated or the level of confidence everyone has in them. It should be recognised that, within the overall national plan, there is going to be a finite limit to the number of people living on our island, if those who do live here are going to be able to travel easily, live in a nice property and enjoy a good rounded life with access to leisure facilities and beautiful countryside. All these factors should be taken into consideration from the national level down.

If we are trying to "level up" the country, we should be doing no more than we have to in the South East, and focus investment in other areas of the country.

Do not agree that an additional 15,941 dwellings should be required for the borough.

I agree that we need more housing but not to the extent that is being forced on us by government.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO<sub>2</sub>, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and highquality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traUc, which is already congested.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population Sgures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO<sub>2</sub>, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownSeld areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and

wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traUc, which is already congested.

The assessed needs represent a significant increase on existing housing stock, with it's associated impact on infrastructure. Given the confines of the area, including AONBs and important greenbelt land, there seems to be limited scope to increase this by a further 10%. Presumably the 'assessed needs' are just that, and should therefore form the basis of development (otherwise, what is the purpose of assessing needs?).

Assessed housing need is already likely to put a strain on the local area; there is no need to go beyond this.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and

---

**User Response: Text**

Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

**Neither Option A OR B. Option 3 Housing need less 10% to discourage internal migration. There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.**

**Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reusable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever**

The requirement for the additional 10% is not clear particularly when the data used to drive these assessed needs is stale.

Our community is semi rural. I cannot see the logic in attempting to surpass the legal minimum.

This depends on the nature of the assessed housing need. The priority should be to make affordable homes for families, younger renters/buyers and replace existing poor quality housing.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The assessed housing need already is accommodating unused planning permissions. Completions have run behind release of planning permissions, and this is traditional and liable to continue due to current economic conditions. 23% is already added to the assessed housing need by the government requirement.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more

---

**User Response: Text**

congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

This is a false choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brown field areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traUc, which is already congested.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

I am unhappy about any further development in the borough given that the borough seems to be expanding year on year with essential infrastructure failing to keep pace with the proliferation of housing. I am therefore reluctant to opt for any option that further increases the councils commitment to building more homes

an additional 1600 dwellings plus healthcare, educational and leisure facilities requires a huge amount of land and infrastructure that simply is not available.

The proposed development of 15,941 new homes will already put a massive infrastructure strain on the Tonbridge and Malling district when considering the limitations of developing on the green belt, without adding an additional 10% on top of this.

Meeting assessed housing need is enough; to do more would be detrimental to the rural nature of the district and risk turning it into another Sevenoaks - essentially a continued outward sprawl of London.

We feel the housing needs are not as stated, but are government-controlled numbers. The borough has a number of large, empty buildings which could be converted into flats for first time owners. But this option is one that TMBC seem to have dis-guarded in their preamble to this consultation

In the period to 2040, the minimum requirement using the standard methodology generates a requirement for 15,941 homes (839 dwellings per annum) . An option of providing an uplift of 10% is presented but this appears to be an arbitrary figure. The minimum is clearly a starting point and there are a number of factors to determine what the actual requirement might be. government guidance indicates that these factors could include: Meeting unmet need from a neighbouring authority; where strategic infrastructure improvements increase need or for those authorities with a growth deal. other circumstances

---

**User Response: Text**

will be where housing delivery has historically been greater than the outcome from the standard method.

A review of the Housing Land Supply Position as at March 2021 reveals that an average of 839 dwellings per annum has only been exceeded twice between 2011 and 2021. An average of 622 was achieved. This has clearly been influenced by a lack of housing land supply shown by the fact that the Council can only demonstrate a 3.17 years supply.

It is unclear where the 10% increase figure has been derived from. In order to support the Government objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it will not be sufficient for Tonbridge and Malling to aim for the minimum number of homes needed. An average of 839 dwellings per annum will not be achieved using this approach. Given historical delivery rates (which are consistently below this level) FECL feel a target of +20% is fully justified in order to broaden the amount of land available and accelerate build rates.

In terms of delivery rates, a stepped trajectory could be considered to boost delivery in the early years of the plan through the identification of smaller sites to support immediate growth whilst strategic sites are progressed.

our area is already over capacity with insufficient local health care etc.

See response to Q2

The target is forced on the council by the Government. The council should not over deliver because I have doubts that infrastructure and capacity of local services will be adequately considered and no doubt some other councils will worm out of their targets or be like TWBC and dump a load of houses on the edge of TMBC, creating issues within this borough (passenger flow through to Tonbridge station for example).

Until the infrastructure is improved in the borough an additional 10% is not practical

TMBC are already struggling to find land suitable for the assessed need. To find 10% more in this area would mean encroaching onto Green Belt or AONB.

There are other areas within the south east that could better meet additional housing needs and be more affordable in the longer term. Additionally, recent changes to working practises have shown that housing stock no longer needs to be within the 1 hour commuting distance of central London and housing can be more evenly distributed throughout the UK, including development of more deprived areas where new housing could bring growth and money to an area.

As with answers given to earlier questions, I do not assess the present Housing Need Assessment to be reliable. I regard the numbers as distorted by our nearness to London where the Green Belt has always protected this area from over-development. In these circumstances Option A Quantum 1 is the only possible answer to Question5 but that should not be taken as an endorsement of that Option.

The housing need should only apply to local families. I do not agree with option A or B as it is looking to provide far to many new homes within beautiful villages with good communities. the plans are detrimental to current families and their enjoyment of the countryside and village life.



---

## User Response: Text

We need better, updated data as the plan uses population figures that are almost 10 years old (pre Brexit and Covid). This could lead to unnecessary development in protected wetlands, Green Belt, and AONBs that are crucial to flood protection, biodiversity and climate change mitigation. The focus should be on brownfield sites.

Option B will, without question, lead to decimation of the Green Belt and AONBs.

1. As the Council is aware, the current Core Strategy was adopted in 2007 and the Site Allocations DPD in 2008. These documents are significantly outdated and as a result of the decision to withdraw the previous local plan review, by the time any new plan is adopted it will have been approximately 18 years since an up to date plan has been in place.
1. In the absence of an up to date plan housing delivery in the Borough has been poor in recent years. The April 2021 housing land supply paper published by the Council places this at just 3.17 years and a Housing Delivery Test result of just 63%, well below the benchmark of 95%.
2. As a result, housing affordability in the Borough is poor. Paragraph 5.3.14 and table 3 of the draft plan note that this is now at a ratio of some 13.39 in terms of median house prices to median earnings. This compares to 11.16 within Kent and 9.05 across England as a whole. The problem is therefore clear and acute.

1. Importantly, the draft plan states:

*“5.3.16. To put this into context, housing affordability in Tonbridge & Malling has, and continues to be, worse than the position at the county, region and national level. **The gap has widened over the last twenty years.** This worsening affordability will make it increasingly challenging for younger households to get their foot on the first step of the property ladder. This is a concern because an injection of first-time buyers is vital to allow existing homeowners to move up the property ladder to meet their changing needs. **The Local Plan can make a difference by making adequate provision to address assessed needs**”*

1. Providing for the identified need plus an allowance of 10% will have a greater impact upon the affordability issue than simply planning for the minimum necessary under the standard methodology.
1. In addition to the need to tackle the issue of affordability generally there is a need to address affordable housing provision. Affordable housing provision (save for very limited Rural Exceptions sites) will only be delivered as part of market housing developments.
1. The Boroughs Affordable housing need is estimated in the draft plan as being 283 new affordable homes each year over the plan period from 2021 to 2040.
1. Affordable housing will not be sought on smaller windfall sites / sites of less than 10 units as per the NPPF definition of major development. Very broadly the plan suggests that 1,050 dwellings are estimated as likely to come forward on small sites of 5 units or less, clearly these will not deliver affordable homes.
1. This reduces the potential from which affordable dwellings could be delivered from 15,941 to 14,891. (There is also likely to be delivery on sites of between 5 and 9 units which similarly would not provide affordable homes although exact numbers are unknown).
1. Taking the 14,891 figure as being the potential dwelling number from which a proportion will be affordable (albeit in reality likely to be less), to meet identified needs (283pa) 5,377 units or 36% would need to be affordable.
1. Clearly final viability and affordability assessment will determine the percentage figure which the Council includes as part of the plan. However, it is likely that due to infrastructure requirements on larger sites and existing use values on urban sites that not all sites will not deliver at this rate.

---

**User Response: Text**

1. By adding 10% to the overall target this at least builds in some flexibility to take account of under provision as a result of viability issues on some sites that will be delivered.
1. More generally the addition of the 10% would provide some contingency within the overall local plan housing strategy making it more likely that it will deliver the housing requirement set by the standard methodology i.e. taking account of the fact that it is generally the case that some allocated sites do not deliver as hoped.
1. Whilst the Interim Sustainability Appraisal highlights some minor concerns regarding the impact of Option 2 in terms of pressure on local facilities and infrastructure (SA2 and SA3), it is of course relevant to note that new development would be expected to provide new facilities and / or at least contributions towards improved capacity.

15. These matters should not therefore weigh against Option 2 as they can be planned for and built into planning policy as part of development allocations.

Option A is adequate

If the government levelling up process is successful then there is likely to be reduced pressure in the south of England as more jobs and better communications are provided in the north.

The housing need could be increased if the area of land stays the same. Is build more flats - in Social Care there is a high need for flats.

Because it seems like the less invasive option to me. Our secondary school age children are able to get to their schools using the buses. My husband can commute to London from Hildenborough train station although he gets there by bicycle. I can commute to Tonbridge for work also.

I am concerned with the amount of traffic on the roads which will only get worse with new houses.

While the quantum of housing is important, we consider that the provision of a balanced housing mix that meets the needs of residents is equally important.

The plan is not using up to date data.

We should focus on existing buildings and brownfield areas to preserve the unnecessary development into greenbelt.

The geography or Tonbridge means its not possible to build further road infrastructure to reduce traffic which is already congested..

I don't understand the questions here but clearly my priory is to retain the green spaces, keep the Green belt areas we have. Retain our villages and the gaps between. The South east is over developed, we don't want the villages to become an urban/ suburban sprawl. Offham is very small village, a historic setting, with only one farm shop, no Post office, no shops, one very small over subscribed Primary school and one pub. The character and charm of the village would change with new housing, lose the green spaces, and open fields which are crucial for the bio-diversity and sustainable of our nature, if

---

**User Response: Text**

all the green spaces are built over we will have more issue with flooding and upsetting the local natural ecosystems.

The 15,941 is excessive. Only approx 1,500 are on the housing register and 3,100 are in the Windfall Allowance. Do not increase the suggested number!

Allow flexibility to adapt to varying demand over time.

There is no need to increase our housing allocation beyond that which is required. The sustainability appraisal findings show significantly poorer results against most of the criteria for Option B compared with Option A.

As outlined in the document, meeting the assessed housing needs will be a 'stretch', with suitable sites in short supply, and will necessarily place more demands on the local transport system and recreational facilities. Therefore it seems reasonable to cater for the assessed needs only.

Given the value of housing in the area and lack of large industry in Kent, as opposed to Thames Valley corridor, home counties, etc. I believe the housing need in Kent, and in particular Tonbridge and Malling, has been grossly overstated. Consequently, the predictions I have been party to through my work, indicate that numbers may be reduced in subsequent parliaments so it is not necessary to front load the house building targets,.

The NPPF (para 61) sets a minimum requirement for LPAs to meet their identified Local Housing Needs, unless in exceptional circumstances. This equates to 839 dwellings per annum based on the 2021 standard method calculation. An additional 10% supply would provide flexibility into the housing supply for the local plan to address market or site specific changes to the delivery of allocated sites. However, the selection of 10% as the buffer figure would benefit from further justification.

Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Prepare Urban Areas now for more housing to meet the needs of future growth

The Local Plan refers to the requirement for 15,941 new homes in the period up to 2040. As was noted in the HVPA meeting to discuss the situation, currently there are 1,500 families on the Council Housing register across the Borough. This suggests that the housing need is not as great as the requirement set by Government. This needs to be challenged by TMBC. It is understood that local MP Tom Tugendhat is also challenging this requirement.

Neither option

Wrotham Parish Council ("WPC") would like to see a third option being tested - one that does not meet the full housing requirement to reflect the fact that:

---

**User Response: Text**

1. the standard methodology calculation is flawed because it uses the metric of housing cost and seeks to reduce this by increasing the quantum of development. In effect this is a measure of demand rather than need.
2. the government has stated it wants to move away from the culture of top-down housing targets which would indicate it also seeks to move to an assessment of need.
3. Para II (b) of the NPPF states that housing need should be reduced where an LPA has a significant quantum of Green Belt and AONB which are over arching policies that restrain development.

The fact that people are badly housed in Britain has more to do with adverse policies after 1979 than the numbers built. Improvements require national legislation to end right to buy, build council housing, end buy to let landlordism and restrict second homes. I cannot see any advantage to increasing the number of homes when so many are left empty.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO<sub>2</sub>, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding.

Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

The MGB around Tonbridge fulfills all of the requirements laid down by the \nppf

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out of date (pre 1914) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and Green Belt that absorb CO<sub>2</sub>, provide wildlife habitats and prevent the town from flooding. Skillful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving Green Belt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography, it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already extremely congested.

I have deliberately not answered Q5 as I believe that the target for TMBC passed down from central government is too high and should be challenged and reduced. Building more houses in the South East does nothing for levelling up.

Two key reasons, firstly that the data used for modelling housing demand is based on assumptions for housing pre covid and the changes in people's working habits. Secondly the constraints of road network and impact of river flooding means there are very few options . I do not want to see Green belt eroded.

The plan uses pre 2014 population figures and has not taken into account Brexit and Covid. The data is out of date and any planning based on these incorrect data which will lead to disproportionate new housing development and without proper infrastructure will be harmful to the community already residing here in Tonbridge.

Other significant areas to consider will be the already rising air pollution as with encroachment of green belt will result in less absorption of CO<sub>2</sub>. Risks of flooding will be greater without essential wildlife habitats.

---

**User Response: Text**

As Tonbridge residents we are already suffering from extreme traffic congestion in the main and even arterial roads. However, the geography of the town does not facilitate building of new roads which will be essential for new infrastructure.

If we have to build as many houses as is being proposed, then this should be kept to a minimum. 15,000+ houses in this Borough is a huge number to build without destroying the nature of the area, let alone the damage it will do to the environment.

- We recommend Option 2 (meeting assessed housing need + 10%) is the preferred quantum option for the spatial strategy.
- National policy states that “as a minimum” strategic policies should provide for their objectively assessed need (Para.11b of the NPPF) with Para.22 of the NPPF also stating that strategic policies should anticipate and respond to long term requirements and opportunities. As such, the starting point should be local development needs, as a minimum, are addressed in full.
- We recommend that the Council should seek to provide at least 10% more than their requirement of 839 dwellings per annum (dpa) (15,941 dwellings across Plan Period) for a number of reasons including:
  - Ensuring sufficient flexibility to the Council’s supply of new homes;
  - Persistent under-delivery in the Borough e.g. Housing Delivery Test Score of 63% which has fallen from 91% in 2020;
  - Impact of two Housing Market Areas (‘HMA’s’) in the Borough – need to try to satisfy the needs of both;
  - Reduces risk of speculative / unplanned / unintended future development; and
  - Provides increased level of certainty to communities.
    - We also suggest that the percentage increase would be more suitable to be 20% (rather than 10%) to ensure a more consistent and varied amount of sites coming forward throughout the Local Plan.
    - Furthermore, whilst we acknowledge that discussions with neighbouring authorities have not yet been undertaken on whether the Borough can accommodate some of their housing and employment needs, we consider an additional of at least 10% (or preferably 20% more) would allow sufficient capacity to accommodate any further need, should it be required, through the Duty to Cooperate. We recommend these discussions commence as soon as possible.
    - In summary, we recommend a buffer of at least 10% be added to the quantum of housing and this should be in place for whatever spatial strategy option is pursued.

No response

I disagree with the numbers put forward by Government and would deem the minimum number of new houses within the green Belt and AONB to be the most that were built to deflect the effects on original population and environment.

It's best not to overcommit to housing needs as I feel it'll lead to rushed decisions. Developers will drip feed housing stock anyway so as to not flood the market and suppress property prices.

We support Option B (Quantum 2) as being the preferred Local Plan strategy for meeting the demonstrable needs of the Borough and its residents. We particularly support the Council’s decision not to consider a policy option to deliver a lower level of growth than required by the evidence – doing so would not be justified by evidence, nor would it be in the wider interests of those residents affected by housing affordability or inequalities and deficiencies in housing stock.

---

**User Response: Text**

The Council's evidence is compelling in justifying Option B.

The Housing Needs Assessment ('HNS') provides wide-ranging analysis of relevant housing factors. Specifically, the HNS demonstrates that:

- Housing affordability represents a significant impediment to home ownership and private renting, with unfeasible income multipliers necessary to allow access into the housing market.
- There are significant imbalances in the existing housing stock, with tenures, sizes and housing standards mismatched against need, particularly at the sub-area level.
- There is considerable need for specialist housing meeting specific needs, including in relation to mobility, age and medical considerations.
- Historic under-delivery of new housing means that the above needs are significant and can only be addressed by increasing the supply of new dwellings.

The housing Market Delivery Study (HMDS') also demonstrates that housing delivery can be maximised through a combination of larger sites on unconstrained land. Focussing growth in fewer larger opportunities well-related to existing settlements offers the opportunity to secure those higher rates of delivery which ensure that wider social objectives can be met.

The interim Sustainability Appraisal Report ('iSA') comparatively assess the two options. Option 2 scores less well in relation to Objectives 1, 2 and 3, driven primarily by uncertainty regarding the ability of existing facilities to absorb higher levels of growth. Whilst a reasonable concern, it is one which can be readily addressed in the planning system through planning obligations. Our responses to other questions sets out that retaining the existing settlement hierarchy and focussing new growth on larger urban centres (Spatial Strategy Option 2) provides the best opportunity for sustainable development, including ensuring that new development can benefit from the existence of existing facilities and sustainable transport choices. Strategic scale development is also well placed, by virtue of development economics and the increased likelihood of securing a critical mass of population, to deliver new or expanded infrastructure to serve new residents and to the benefit of existing residents. For that reason, we consider that the iSA analysis of Option B is potentially pessimistic, and can be prevented as an outcome by use of planning obligations at the time of securing planning permission for development.

We therefore consider that making provision for at least the assessed housing need, and aiming beyond that, will ensure that the emerging Local Plan meets the wider needs of the Borough, in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Tonbridge has seen a lot of development which has not been for local residents and being in the Flood Risk area should not have anymore development than is required locally.

Not in favour of any great expansion in this area for reasons outlined in the answer to question 4.

We should be seeking actively to encourage development (economic. and housing) outside the SE of England.

No Response

It seems that none of the past planning have met there targets - +10% is too ambitious.

---

**User Response: Text**

According to reports, housing needs are already overestimated, especially in the South East.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownSeld areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

If I have understood the question it is between building the minimum or frontloading the building plans. I am against frontloading because much is uncertain in the next 18 years and the more you build (the +10% allows for a compounding effect) the more 'gravitational' force the urban areas you have will exert on the options and challenges that have yet to be revealed. You need as free a hand as possible at this stage.

We appear to constantly focus on more, more, more. In real terms, if we require more properties in 10-20 years time, then we can always address it then. If you start with the correct requirement, then homes will be built to facilitate the requirement of the people and take in to account the services that they will require. Once you set the number, people will work towards it and try not to exceed, therefore, the larger that number is the more developers will try to squeeze in. Many new developments fail to offer sufficient outdoor space for the volume of proposed occupants of the properties (tiny gardens, limited off road parking, etc)

Why won't you let us inform strategy ? Instead you give a Hobson's choice.

This is not a consultation.

How can you consider this questionnaire fit for purpose?

Do you think you will convince the public that you chose our preferred option?

It's predicted that population growth rates will decline, given the environmental impact caused by over population, therefore, it's a risk that in the next 30 years, there could be surplus housing needs following the end of the 'baby boomer' generation.

---

**User Response: Text**

The assessed housing need which appears to increase the area housing stock by about a third in 20 years is clearly nonsense when compared to the likely change in the UK population as a whole which is going to increase little if at all.

The plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then.

Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development of existing brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt

Also, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

My view is new housing development should be kept to a minimum. If there is a future requirement for additional housing needs then that should be assessed and evaluated once it is confirmed. Particularly given the likely challenges that the housing market is likely to face given the economic outlook.

The Council identifies its housing need as being 15,941 homes across the plan period (2021-2040). This is based on the Council's local housing need figure of 839 dpa calculated using the standard method (with a 2021 base date). This figure is, in accordance with the NPPF (2021), the minimum number of homes needed that the Borough needs to plan for. However, there are clear reasons for going above the minimum level of housing required in Tonbridge and Malling:

- **Expression in national policy and guidance as a 'minimum'**: Government guidance reiterates throughout that the standard method produces a 'minimum' starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area (for example see PPG ID 2a:010). This is also reiterated in paragraph 61 of the NPPF. Local authorities nationally will need to exceed their minimum local housing need figure in order to deliver at least 300,000 homes per year nationally.
- **Uncapped standard method**: The Council's local housing need figure (839 dpa) is 'capped' at 40% above its household projections. A cap is applied in the standard method to help ensure the minimum local housing need figure is as 'deliverable as possible' but does not 'reduce housing need itself' (PPG ID:2a-007). As a result, the PPG sets out that strategic policies adopted with a cap may require early review to ensure that 'any housing need above the capped level is planned for as soon as is reasonably possible'.

The uncapped standard method figure for the Borough is 946 dpa; a figure which fully accounts for the uplift applied owing to the Borough's high median affordability ratio. Applying this figure over the plan period generates a need for at least 17,974 homes: 13% more homes than the capped standard method. The PPG states that 'where the minimum annual local housing need figure is subject to a cap, consideration can still be given to whether a higher level of need could realistically be delivered. This may help prevent authorities from having to undertake an early review of the relevant policies.'

- **Affordability and past delivery**: As shown Table 3 of the draft Reg.18 plan, the Council's median affordability ratio has increased to 13.39 in 2021 (the latest figure). Affordability tends to worsen where housing growth fails to meet demand, pricing out newly forming households and young families.

Notwithstanding, affordability has worsened in Tonbridge and Malling significantly despite the Borough delivering more homes since 2011/12 than its housing requirement at the time (as shown in Table 2.10 in the 'Housing Needs Assessment (2022) report). However, the Council's housing requirement was only 425 dpa across most of this period (a requirement derived from the regional South East Plan, which was not based on an objective assessment of housing need). The significant difference between the current local housing need figure now and the



---

**User Response: Text**

former requirement suggests the real demand for homes was far in excess of past housing requirements. Therefore any housing target in the emerging plan should not be arbitrarily reduced on the basis that it might be well in excess of historic housing requirements.

- **Support working age populations:** Lichfields analysis of the 2021 Census shows that all HMAs in England (bar one) which delivered housing growth at or above the national average saw their working age population grow over the last 10 years. This highlights the key role that housing growth plays in attracting and maintaining a workforce, which in turn also helps support local economies and sustainable commuting patterns.
- **Unmet needs:** There are likely to be significant unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities; particularly Sevenoaks given its levels of constraints. The NPPF tests of soundness include that plans are ‘positively prepared’, in that they provide a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s need so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and consistent with sustainable development (NPPF para 35a).
- **Buffer for flexibility:** To ensure housing needs are addressed, a sufficient buffer of sites should be identified above and beyond the minimum number of homes required (NPPF Para 15). A buffer of at least 10% would provide some flexibility to cover for non-delivery in the event sites (particularly those with higher risk delivery assumptions) do not come forward.

In the context of the above, Tonbridge and Malling should be planning for at the very least 10% above its minimum local housing need. It should also test the delivery of the uncapped standard method and identify a buffer of sites to provide flexibility as the plan develops.

Do not agree with mandated development and especially do not support spoiling rural , country , green fields and areas of natural beauty

Old disused existing buildings should be refurbished/rebuilt before developing new areas

The quantities being asked to build is too high in a borough which is the majority greenbelt and rural. So the lesser is the only viable option if we are to keep TMBC from being over developed.

contingency plan

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Whilst all areas need some development, Green Belt was initially set up to legally protect these areas. It is sacrosanct.

---

**User Response: Text**

We do not need to build additional capacity at this stage. If the assessed need changes (up or down) then the plans can be altered accordingly. The assessed need should cater for local needs and not 'urban migration to the countryside'. It would seem reasonable that national population growth could be spread proportionally across all areas (eg if population increase is 1% then London and TM increase in housing could both be 1%) but migration into TM over and above this would not be desirable.

Each additional percentage gives developers the opportunity to take more of the green belt.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownSeld areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge’s geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic which is already congested.

Since Brexit housing requirements have dropped, this combined with the reduced birth rates means that housing requirement calculations are outdated and over inflated.

The requirement of housing can change with government plans and the argument should be made for a lower amount of housing in this area. Areas that have not made significant housing developments (Like Sevenoaks Council) should be working to make up shortfalls from previous building plans.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and South East Water supply as well as more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

The Standard Method determines “***the minimum number of homes needed***”. This is a minimum not a maximum. As a minimum, TMBC should plan to meet its needs in full and we fully support Paragraph 4.5 of the Sustainability Appraisal that states: “*No option has been considered or assessed that promotes development below the 839 dwellings per annum as it is considered an unreasonable alternative in the context of national policy and local evidence on housing affordability. In addition, given the large pool of sites currently identified and their potential yield, the borough will likely have sufficient available land to deliver the amount of development that the evidence shows is needed. In these circumstances, the Council considers that any option which did not deliver as a minimum the identified housing need does not constitute a reasonable alternative.*”

We agree a sufficient pool of sites exists to deliver the minimum requirement of the Standard Method.

We prefer Option B: to exceed the minimum by up to 10% (or more) because:

- Delivering 10% more will provide more surety that the needs of the Borough are met i.e should allocated sites fail or be slow to deliver. 10% could act as a contingency to ensure that the minimum is at least met.
- The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment Exceptional Circumstances (Strategic) Note (July 2022) states TMBC has a high housing demand and acute affordability challenges. It has an undersupply of housing which is worsening. To

## User Response: Text

significantly boost the supply of housing in line with para 60 of the Framework, and in order to meet the needs of different groups of people, and to achieve the first 3 visions and objectives outline in Q1, it is essential that a sufficient supply of sites comes forward over the plan period.

- The Housing Needs Study states there is an annual net shortfall of 283 dwellings for affordable housing needs. Whilst the PPG does not require TMBC to plan to meet this need in full, economic viability can be a reason why 40% affordable housing might not be delivered. We consider that planning for a higher level of growth is more likely to ensure that the affordable housing needs are met. Site ref. 59842 is put forward on the basis that 40% affordable housing, together with the other benefits of Phase 1 (including flood betterment and 20% biodiversity net gain) is economically viable.

Table 4.1 in the Sustainability Appraisal compares Option A (meet minimum) to Option B (minimum+10%). Para 4.6 suggests that Option B could have a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 1 *“as delivering growth beyond assessed needs has more potential to cause capacity issues at existing healthcare facilities if they become overloaded.”* This misses the fact that as part of the preparation of a Local Plan, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be prepared to identify the infrastructure needed to support development. Planning policies should be drawn to either require infrastructure to be delivered as part of proposals (i.e on major sites) or to seek contributions towards infrastructure provision via CIL and s106 payments. We consider that the effect in SA terms should be adjusted to reflect that Local Plan 2040 should be effectively planning for infrastructure needs.

We agree with Para 4.9 that there would be a significant positive effect through delivering a higher level of housing through Option B. However, we disagree with the remainder of Para 4.9 which states: *“However, this level of housing delivery would be in excess of what the local housing markets have supported over the past decade, as demonstrated by the Housing Market Delivery Study. Therefore, there is uncertainty attached to this option as there is a question mark around its deliverability.”*

Whilst the HMDS does raise this uncertainty, the HMDS also reports that the latest median workplace-based affordability ratio indicate that the balance between supply and demand is worsening. The HMDS recommends TMBC intervene in the market to accelerate the supply of new homes by ensuring that planning policy reflects the current and emerging demand and supply balance for homes. The HMDS is therefore advising the Council to develop planning policy that guide development to maintain mixed and balanced communities to provide a greater diversity of supply which is likely to lead to faster rates of market absorption.

The SA therefore should not at this stage rule out Option B. Option B may be the best way of enabling TMBC to achieve a balanced and mixed community since it will significantly boost the supply of homes and by allocating more land within the Tier 2 Rural Service Centres (RSCs). If growth were focused to the urban area such as around Tonbridge Town alone, this will naturally mean a higher yield of flatted homes i.e. not creating a mixed community and not creating a diverse supply of unit types.

Apportioning part of the housing requirement to the RSC of Hadlow, which has historically seen a very low level of growth, will add diversity to the supply of homes at Hadlow, and would also ensure the delivery of a mix of tenure including affordable housing. This would contribute to the creation of a more balanced community.

In conclusion, land at Maidstone Road (Site ref 59842) can deliver a mix of property types and sizes and affordable housing as demonstrated through the Site Promotion Document. The site is also shown to come forward in 2 phases as required to ensure that the local market can absorb the supply at a steady rate over the plan period.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skillful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge’s geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

---

**User Response: Text**

the quotas are already too high

No more housing Wouldham has enough .  
as a village we can't cope with the amount of traffic & parking is bad . No bus service .  
Wouldham should be green belt

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

We note that both options could harm biodiversity and reduce natural resilience by building on greenfield sites. We therefore prefer the option that takes least land.

There is no option for fewer so this is the only answer I can give.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO<sub>2</sub>, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brown field areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and Option A Quantum 1 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need Option B Quantum 2 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need + up to 10% wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

The requirement of delivering 839 dpa should be clearly recognised as a minimum requirement as set out at paragraph 11b of the NPPF which states, “strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing”.

Thus, in ensuring the 839 dpa or indeed 923 dpa is a minimum (+10%), this will provide the basis to allow affordability to improve across the Borough which currently sits at 13.39 (property price to earnings ratio). The Council therefore needs to do everything it can to ensure the target used is the minimum and that there is “a sufficient supply and mix of sites” (NPPF, paragraph 68) allocated which are deliverable across the Plan period to improve affordability. This is vital.

- The Assessed Housing Need is itself a challenging target, and in our view represents more than share for the natural need of the area
- Standard Method is a flawed methodology
- There is policy uncertainty at national level over the future of Standard Method targets

I have selected Option B, because I understand this is the **minimum** statutory requirement, but I know that this may need to rise to + 20% if particular circumstances arise.

---

**User Response: Text**

We have enough housing development in the TMBC borough already

We are already looking at huge numbers to increase the number of dwellings by 25% over 18 years is a shocking number.

I genuinely believe the housing targets imposed by the government are unrealistic and will cause untold strain on public services including the transport network and access to everyday and critical services. I moved into the Borough in January 2021 and there were no spaces at Doctors Surgeries so one had to be allocated to me by a Central Body. The Services and Infrastructure need to be in place to support so many more households and I do not see how that is going to be possible.

We also need to act as custodians of the countryside for future generations.

I feel the need for housing isn't as steady. More notice should be taken of local knowledge.

The fewer houses being built in the area the better. None at all would be my preference. Already, too many people, too much pollution, too much rubbish, too many cars. The area is being ruined.

There is no need to increase our housing allocation beyond that which is required. The sustainability appraisal findings show significantly poorer against most of the criteria for Option B compared with Option A.

Berkeley believes that the local housing need (LHN) figure arrived at using the standard method should be a minimum requirement for the new Local Plan.

A 10% uplift to the LHN would allow for some flexibility in plan making at this stage, would help to meet additional affordable housing need, and the need of specific parts of the community. This option could therefore be supported. However, it is difficult to ascertain from the evidence published to date (including the Housing Needs Assessment), why 10% has been alighted upon and so the level of uplift requires clarification and justification to garner full support.

To determine the number of homes for which to plan, Tonbridge & Malling Council will need to start from the **minimum** local housing need arrived at using the Standard Method. The Council's evidence suggests the following:

*“The latest standard method calculation results in a minimum need of 839 dwellings each year. This compares with delivery of an annual average of 591 over the 5 years to 2020/21.”* Berkeley agrees that this quantum of growth is a reasonable starting point. However, as is set out in guidance for the Standard Method, when considering its own needs, the Council will need to carefully assess economic growth both expected, and aspired to, in Tonbridge & Malling and what this means for the housing requirement. It is not clear from the evidence published to date whether any implications of economic strategies have been considered. The Housing Needs Assessment only references the effects of the current economy – house prices, activity on the high street etc. There is limited assessment of job growth and what this might mean for housing needs.

Moreover, the Council will also need to assess the specific needs for certain parts of the community, such as the elderly, disabled people and those who do not live in ‘bricks and mortar’ homes. The Housing Needs Assessment does consider these matters, and summarises its conclusions as follows:

*“...there are three main policy areas that require particular attention from both a planning policy and social policy perspective:*

---

**User Response: Text**

- *the challenge of enabling the quantity and mix of housing that needs to be delivered, including an appropriate level of affordable housing;*
- *the challenge of ensuring that the housing and support needs of older people are met going forward; and*
- *the challenge of ensuring that the needs of people with disabilities is appropriately addressed.”*

On the face of it, it would appear that there is some evidence here to include an uplift from the LHN to reach an appropriate housing requirement in the Local Plan. The justification for choosing a 10% uplift is currently unclear, however, and requires further explanation.

The Council will also need to keep in mind that from this starting point it will need to consider whether there are any unmet needs in neighbouring areas that also need to be included in the housing requirement. The Council will need to clearly demonstrate cooperation on strategic matters including potential unmet housing needs with neighbours.

I suspect we will start to see twin pressures of population decline and lack of affordability by 2040 pulling back demand.

No need to exceed housing need

The current level of need must be re-assessed against the target. It must not be greater

I do not see the need in increasing beyond anticipated requirement outlined.

It will already be difficult to find the houses required in this Borough. if there was option for -90% i would have selected that.

The government needs to stop this countries population increasing by 400 plus thousand each year in order to relieve the obvious pressure on this small islands limited space.

Prevent over develop enemy

If the housing need is met there is no reason for an increase

The current need is already too great. The addition will lead to extreme stress on local services, healthcare and road congestion even worse than present.

Because the other option is worse for Hildenborough, as more housing will exacerbate the current state of schools and GP surgery at capacity/under pressure, the main road through Hildenborough already at 85-100% of capacity and many areas at serious risk of flooding

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014

---

**User Response: Text**

population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population gures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and Option A Quantum 1 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need Option B Quantum 2 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need + up to 10% wetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge’s geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population Sgures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from Tooding. Skilful and high-quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownSeld areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt andandwetlands. Additionally, due to Tonbridge’s geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic which is already congested.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out of date population figures. it does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas that flood and greenbelt that absorbs Co2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

The plan is using out of date data. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential

---

**User Response: Text**

wetlands and Green belt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Due to Tonbridge's geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

- The borough is already overcrowded.
- Schools and healthcare are already stretched and there is no need for the extra congestion that further expansion would bring.

Option B is unrealistic and Option A is optimistic at best as places like Hildenborough have become a magnet for people moving out of London in search of greener, open space since COVID, not to mention the shift since BREXIT. Therefore the population figures have increased and continue to increase since the original plan was put in place based on figures from 2014.



---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council adopted its last Local Plan (the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy) in 2007, i.e. 15 years ago. The Core Strategy covered the period up to 2021. The new Local Plan is not intended to be adopted until 2024 by which time the previous plan will be 17 years old and 3 years beyond its Plan Period. The Council has therefore not planned positively for ongoing growth and has allowed the Plan to expire without producing a replacement. As a consequence, the Council has found itself failing in its delivery of its 5-year housing land supply and performing poorly in relation to the Housing Delivery Test. The presumption in favour of sustainable development has therefore applied to the determination of planning applications for several years and the Council is currently required to apply a 20% buffer to its 5-year housing land requirement.

The Standard Method for Calculating Housing Need (the Standard Method) sets a minimum housing requirement to accommodate growth. It is not a limit on the quantum of development that could be planned for over the Plan Period. To plan positively for growth, particularly in light of past failures to deliver sufficient housing to meet needs which have resulted in unplanned windfall development on greenfield land, a 10% buffer should be included as a minimum to the quantum of development to be delivered over the Plan Period.

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council is consulting on the proposal to alter Green Belt boundaries to accommodate housing need over the Plan Period. The NPPF (section 13) is clear that in redefining Green Belt Boundaries policies need to take account of longer term needs which extend beyond the Plan Period in order that revised Green Belt boundaries can be maintained. It is therefore important that the Council plans for needs beyond the minimum requirements detailed in the Standard Method. This should be for a minimum of 10% addition to ensure there is no requirement to further change the Green Belt boundaries after the next Plan Period.

Quantum 3 - House need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration".

**There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.**

**No, we should be building only for international migration, and for affordable housing for local first time buyers.**

As set out in NPPF, the standard method figure is a minimum starting point. In this case the baseline minimum has been capped to 839pa, rather than the actual need for 891pa (uncapped as of 2021), or 946pa (uncapped as of 2022). In accordance with NPPG, consideration should therefore be given to whether the uncapped minimum need could realistically be delivered. This may help avoid the need to undertake a further early review of the LP to address such needs. There may also be a need for an upward adjustment to the minimum assessed housing need figure, to fully address the boroughs need for affordable housing, if, as seems the case at present, current policy options are insufficient to meet such needs from qualifying sites alone.

Similarly, further upward adjustments may well be required to assist adjoining LPAs with proven unmet housing needs. Sevenoaks DC for example has previously sought assistance, and are at a similar stage in their LP review. The need or otherwise to assist adjoining LPAs is therefore likely to be confirmed well in advance of the formal submission of TMBC Local Plan for examination. It will be important therefore for TMBC to have demonstrated it has been proactive in assessing the contribution it could make to assist such LPAs, and accord with NPPF paragraph 35. This includes the testing of further reasonable alternatives through the SA process, rather than limiting this to the two stated at present.

Once the housing requirement is established, it will be important to ensure sufficient land is identified to meet this within the

plan period. In this respect it is reasonable and indeed established practice to instill a contingency or slippage allowance of at least the 10% stated in Option B. For all these reasons we would advocate TMBC adopting a positive and proactive stance

to such matters. Option 2 should therefore be regarded as a minimum at this stage until further assessments are completed on the need for further upward adjustments. Additional quantum options, including uncapped need, should then be assessed

---

**User Response: Text**

through the SA.

Rydon advocates a further Option C - Meeting LHN plus 20%

In line with the NPPF (para 61) we suggest that as an absolute minimum TMBC should be aiming to meet the figure of 839 dwellings per annum based on the 2021 standard method calculation. In practice, the Council should be aiming to meet the assessed housing need with an additional 10% supply. This would provide flexibility and resilience into the housing supply. A buffer would help ensure a reliable supply in the event of potential non-implementations, delays to delivery (including beyond the plan period), and economic factors within the market. A buffer would also be seen as an effective method of ensuring security within the supply against future changes to the local housing requirement within the methodology, for example in case of new affordability data that increases the requirement. However, the selection of 10% as the buffer figure would benefit from further justification for this to be a sound approach.

The current methodology determines that TMBC must deliver 839 dwellings per annum or 15,941 dwellings (gross) across the plan period up to 2040. Gladman consider that Option B, meeting assessed housing need with an additional 10% is the most suitable quantum of growth for the borough. Accounting for an additional 10% ensures that neighbouring authorities with similar pressures on housing needs are considered and provides the necessary flexibility to be resilient to unforeseen changes that may occur during the latter years of the plan period.

- None of the options are supported as each assumes expansion of Kings Hill
- Kings Hill should remain within the confines of its airbase brownfield site as per previous plans.
- Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the coalescence of communities.
- No building on valuable green spaces within existing areas should be considered as they are too valuable to the local population. NPPF Green Space Policy ref 99 states that "Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings should not be built on."
- We believe the development of brownfield is preferable to destroying open countryside, valuable farmland and green spaces.

No need for meeting more than assessed needs.

WMPC and TMBC believe the Housing Targets are already too high. Beyond meeting assessed need using the government method of calculation, allowing for a further 10% would result in an unacceptable level of harm.

The Council should aim to meet the assessed housing need for the borough plus 10% given the previous under delivery across the borough, in neighbouring LPAs and more widely. This will result in greater annual delivery across the borough which is an important consideration beyond just allocation of sites. The need to ensure that the housing market areas are met fully and delivered is crucial. The under delivery of housing across the majority of LPAs is well documented so the Council is better to be realistic of a situation so that it can be more proactive in its approach rather than reactive. More holistically (as is evident with other LPAs), this should also reduce the need to review Local Plans as regularly which should free up

---

**User Response: Text**

LPA resource to deliver other concentrated services in a timely fashion.

The requirement should be met, which includes a buffer. However, much of the increase is associated with the high house price / earnings ratio, which will not be affected by the proposed development and as such, the local plan should reflect the government guidance on the location of the required development. Housing assessed need is warped by the high price in the green belt areas, and this needs to be addressed.

The requirement should be met, which includes a buffer. However, much of the increase is associated with the high house price / earnings ratio, which will not be affected by the proposed development and as such, the local plan should reflect the government guidance on the location of the required development. Housing assessed need is warped by the high price in the green belt areas, and this needs to be addressed.

We recommend Option 2 (meeting assessed housing need + 10%) is the preferred quantum option for the spatial strategy.

3.69 National policy states that “as a minimum” strategic policies should provide for their objectively assessed need (Para.11b of the NPPF) with Para.22 of the NPPF also stating that strategic policies should anticipate and respond to long term requirements and opportunities. As such, the starting point should be local development needs, as a minimum, are addressed in full.

3.70 We recommend that the Council should seek to provide at least 10% more than their requirement of 839 dwellings per annum (dpa) (15,941 dwellings across Plan Period) for a number of reasons including:

- Ensuring sufficient flexibility to the Council’s supply of new homes;
- Persistent under-delivery in the Borough e.g. Housing Delivery Test Score of 63% which has fallen from 91% in 2020;
- Impact of two Housing Market Areas (‘HMA’s’) in the Borough – need to try to satisfy the needs of both;
- Reduces risk of speculative / unplanned / unintended future development; and
- Provides increased level of certainty to communities.

3.71 We also suggest that the percentage increase would be more suitable to be 20% (rather than 10%) to ensure a more consistent and varied amount of sites coming forward throughout the Local Plan.

3.72 Furthermore, whilst we acknowledge that discussions with neighbouring authorities have not yet been undertaken on whether the Borough can accommodate some of their housing and employment needs, we consider an additional of at least 10% (or preferably 20% more) would allow sufficient capacity to accommodate any further need, should it be required, through the Duty to Cooperate. We recommend these discussions commence as soon as possible

In summary, we recommend a buffer of at least 10% be added to the quantum of housing and this should be in place for whatever spatial strategy option is pursued.

The Government target figures for the South East should be reduced with a view to supporting the declared UK-wide levelling-up strategy.

Trenport support Option B – meeting housing need as a minimum with a flexibility addition of up to 10%. Given the challenges to delivering the quantum of housing to meet need, the additional flexibility allowance will allow a greater range of site size, location and type to be brought forward to ensure that the housing trajectory does not have to be ‘stepped’ but delivers consistently through the plan period.

---

**User Response: Text**

We note the options provided are

Option A - Quantum 1 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need

Option B - Quantum 2 – Meeting Assessed Housing Need + up to 10%

5.2 Given the commentary in the Reg 18 Plan at paras 5.3.13 – 5.3.16 about housing affordability, and the current housing land supply situation and past delivery rates, as set out in the Housing Land Supply Position Statement (March 2021), we believe there is a real need for the plan to review the need to deliver the Assessed Housing Need + up to 20% rather than that promoted in question 5. Our rationale for this is set out below

a) Local Housing Need and the Minimum Housing Requirement

5.3 Whilst the starting point for determining the Local Housing Need (“LHN”) is the Government’s Standard Method, which for TMBC currently equates to 839 dpa [See The Forward to the Draft Plan and Paragraph 5.3.2 on Page 26 of the Draft Plan], PPG is clear that the Standard Method identifies the minimum annual housing need figure [Housing and Economic Needs Assessment chapter of the PPG – Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 2a-002-20190220 Re-vision date: 20 02 2019]. i.e. it is just the starting point and should not be treated as the housing requirement figure. To this end PPG identifies a number of instances where it might be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the Standard Method indicates [Housing and Economic Needs Assessment chapter of the PPG Paragraph 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20201216 Revision date: 16 12 2020]. This the PPG makes clear will need to be assessed prior to, and separate from, considering how much of the overall need can be accommodated (and then translated into a housing requirement figure for the strategic policies in the plan). To this end PPG suggests that circumstances where this may be appropriate include, but are not limited to, situations where increases in housing need are likely to exceed past trends because of:

- growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable, for example where funding is in place to promote and facilitate additional growth;
- strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or
- an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a Statement of Common Ground;

5.4 Having regard to the above, matters such as a high affordability ratio that is following a rising trend (see below), along with significant affordable housing need, historic under delivery, and of course the importance of ensuring an adequate buffer to cater for under supply, or instances where the Plan strategy fails to deliver as expected, are all sound reasons for considering an uplift.

5.5 Despite the way in which it is couched, question 5 appears to relate to the issue of housing supply, not the requirement i.e. whether the Draft Plan makes provision for a 10% uplift beyond the LHN in terms of its supply. This is a different issue entirely, to which we will return below, and does not address the importance of planning positively by setting an appropriate Local Plan Housing Requirement. As set out above the PPG is very clear about the obligation to establish the need before looking at it and how it can be met. To this end neither the draft plan nor the evidence base appear to have given any consideration to the issue of the requirement and any potential uplift to address the issues we have outlined in para 5.4 above.

This in our opinion is a serious oversight on the part of the Council and goes to the heart of both the Soundness of the approach taken and Legal Compliance particularly in relation to the DtC, which we will return to below.

b) Affordability

5.6 Paras 5.3.13 – 5.3.16 of the Draft Plan are clear about the significance of the housing affordability issue across the Borough and how it has worsened over time, whilst para 5.3.18 highlights the fact that the plan should, as a minimum meet the assessed need for housing in full because ‘anything less would have the effect of worsening housing affordability and run the risk of not delivering key national planning policy objectives’. To this end we note, when looking at the ONS House price to workplace-based earnings ratio – March 2021 that the ratio of median house price to median gross annual workplace-based earnings by local authority district, England and Wales [ONS House price to workplace-based earnings ratio – March 2022 – tables 5c & 6c <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepop-ulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoworkplacebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian>], 1997 to 2021 indicates that the ratio of median house price to median gross annual workplace-based earnings in TMBC has increased significantly over the past 10 years, and

**User Response: Text**

that TMBC is now the 3rd least affordable Borough in the county after Tunbridge Wells and Sevenoaks, who, together with the western part of Tonbridge and Malling comprise the West Kent HMA.

JAA table 1 – Extracts from ONS median house price to median gross annual workplace-based earnings across Kent - 1997 to 2021

Authority	2009	2012	2015	2018	2020	2021
Medway	5.34	5.73	6.90	8.67	7.69	8.72
Ashford	7.55	7.60	9.02	10.61	10.38	10.45
Canterbury	7.37	7.89	9.49	10.96	11.20	12.86
Dartford	5.76	6.70	8.48	9.67	8.73	8.86
Dover	5.60	6.03	7.29	9.37	7.12	9.25
Gravesham	6.34	6.46	7.44	9.83	8.65	10.90
Maidstone	7.43	8.19	9.05	11.21	10.33	10.85
Sevenoaks	8.98	11.31	13.86	14.81	12.43	14.47
Folkestone	7.57	6.61	7.80	9.24	10.76	11.20
Swale	5.81	6.28	7.11	9.13	9.31	10.10
Thanet	7.46	7.66	8.52	10.49	10.14	10.74
TMBC	7.79	8.21	9.97	11.93	11.93	13.39
TWBC	8.32	8.70	10.98	12.71	13.35	15.43

During this period, the lower quartile house price to income ratio from 8.77 to 13.17

5.7 The rapid increase in the affordability ratio is in our opinion clear evidence of the lack of housing delivery that has taken place over the last 10 year period within the Borough, as demonstrated below. Simply providing for the LHN as calculated through the Standard Method will only slow the rate of decline in affordability no more. For an improvement in the affordability situation to occur positive action is required through the provision of more housing over and above the LHN.

c) Affordable Housing Need

5.8 Linked to the issue of affordability is the significant need for affordable housing identified in the Borough, as acknowledged at para 5.3.16 of the Draft Plan and in the Housing Needs Survey 2022 (HNS) that forms part of the evidence base.

5.9 The HNS 2022 confirms a minimum net annual shortfall for affordable homes of 283 dpa. This has been arrived at by calculating the gross need of 753 dpa and then reducing this to take account of expected annual affordable housing supply from various sources (470 dpa) [See Tables C6 and C7 on Pages 123-124 of HNS 2022]. The figure of 283 dpa must therefore be seen as a minimum because it is dependent on the supply assumptions set out in Appendix C of the HNS 2022.

5.10 Even assuming the net figure relied upon by the Council is correct this still represents a significant level of need, being 33.7% of the total LHN. Whilst we understand the Council are proposing an affordable housing policy requiring 40% onsite provision, this will only be triggered for those sites that meet the qualifying criteria. It is therefore highly unlikely that the affordable housing need will be met. Given the decreasing trend in terms of affordability set out above, the gross affordable housing need of 753 dpa is highly likely to increase over the plan period, leading to an increase in the net shortfall and in turn a higher number of people in need and on the Council's housing waiting list.

**User Response: Text**

5.11 In the context of the above we note that according to information produced by KCC [See KCC Strategic Commissioning Statistical Bulletin (September 2022) Affordable Housing in Kent 2020-2021 – web link [https://www.kent.gov.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/7356/Affordable-housing-in-Kent.pdf](https://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/7356/Affordable-housing-in-Kent.pdf) and DLUHC table 1011 C <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-affordable-housing-supply> LA Name Tonbridge and Malling (last update June 2022)] TMBC have over the past 10 years, only delivered on average 19.75% affordable housing. Even if one assumes an average of 20%, this suggests that the plan would need to deliver over 1,400dpa to meet the identified affordable housing needs of the Borough [ $100/20 \times 283 = 1415\text{dpa}$ ].

JAA table 2 – record of TMBC affordable housing delivery 2011-2021 as set out in information produced by DLUHC and KCC

	2011 - 12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	Total
Net additional dwellings	444	390	608	487	912	830	1033	455	447	441	6094
Total affordable dwellings	47	164	249	106	104	55	116	256	75	32	1204
% of total	10.6	42.1	43.8	22.1	11.4	6.6	9.9	60.7	16.78%	7.25%	19.75%

5.12 Whilst we are not advocating this level of growth, the above demonstrates the need for an uplift to the LHN figure to boost the supply of open market and affordable homes and thus help address the affordable housing needs of the Borough.

d) Past Under Delivery

5.12 We note the Councils' Housing Land Supply Position as at 31 March 2021 indicates, based upon the housing need of 839 dpa plus a 20% buffer, and the assumptions made on the supply, that the Council is only able to demonstrate 3.17 years of Housing Land Supply between 1 April 2021 and 31 March 2026. We further note that when one reviews the Oct 2017 AMR (the last AMR produced by TMBC), and update this with information on delivery set out in the HDT and KCC's statistical bulletins, and set this against the Councils position on the housing requirement, it's clear that TMBC have a long history of undersupply.

JAA table 3 – history of housing delivery against requirement 2006 – 2021/22

Year	Requirement*	Delivery (gross)	Shortfall	Cumulative shortfall against SEP, withdrawn LPR and standard method	Cumulative shortfall against withdrawn LPR and standard method only
2006-7	450	850**	+400		
2007-8	450	839	+389	+789	
2008-9	450	798	+348	+1,137	
2009-10	450	372	-78	+1,059	
2010-11	450	351	-99	+960	
2011-12	450	444	-6	+954	-6
2012-13	450	394	-56	+898	-62
2013-14	696	608	-88	+810	-150
2014-15	696	487	-209	+601	-359
2015-16	696	912	+216	+817	-143
2016-17	696	830***	+134	+952	-9
2017-18	696	1166	+470	+1,422	-+461

**User Response: Text**

2018-19	696	455	-241	+1,182	+219
2019-20	696	477	-291	+891	-72
2020-21	843****	447	-366	+625	-438
2021-22	839*****	?			
Total		9,530  (6,220 since 2011/12)			
Annual average delivery rate		628  (622 between 2011/12 and 2020/21)			

[\*We note table 2.10 of the HNS suggests an LDF requirement of 425dpa from 2011/12 – 2018/19, but would question the legitimacy of this figure given the position adopted by the council in para 2.32 of the 2017 AMR which states: *This AMR deals with the 2016/17 period after the SEP was revoked. The SEP required the provision of 450 units per year on average, which is a total of 6,750 units between 2006 and 2021 (the LDF Plan period). In March 2014 a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was completed which identified the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for the Borough. The SHMA was updated in August 2014 in response to the 2012- based Sub National Population Projections. Following the publication of the Government’s 2012-based Household Projections in February 2015 a further 2 updates of the SHMA was undertaken. The final report emerged in September 2016 that recognised the current Objectively Assessed Need which is 696 units per annum; 13,920 units in total for the period 2011-31. It is on this basis that we have assessed the current housing land supply position, substituting the 450 from 2013/14 onwards because this was the first year after the abolition of the SEP.*]

[\*\* Source – Oct 2017 AMR]

[\*\*\* Source – delivery figures for the period 2016/17 onwards are from the Housing Land Supply Position Statement (March 2021).]

[\*\*\*\* Standard method 2020]

[\*\*\*\*\* Standard method 2021]

5.13 The fact the Council have in 9 out of the past 12 years failed to meet their annual housing requirement, and have accumulated a substantial running deficit would suggest to us that there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, and that in order to address this there needs for an uplift to the LHN figure.

5.14 The Council’s history of under delivery is further denoted by the latest HDT results which, as set out below, suggest the Council only delivered 63% of the HDT requirement, which was itself adjusted to take on board the possible effects of Covid on housing delivery, and thus set a lower requirement than that associated with the standard methodology.

JAA table 4 – extract from Jan 2022 HDT results

	Number of	Number of	Number of	Total number	Number of homes	Number of homes	Number of homes	Total number	Housing Delivery	Housing Delivery
--	--------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	---------------------

**User Response: Text**

	homes required	homes required	homes required	of homes required	delivered	delivered	delivered	of homes delivered	Test: 2021 measurement	Test: 2021 consequence
Area name	2018/19	19/20	20/21		2018/19	19/20	20/21			
Tonbridge & Malling	854	774	561	2189	457	471	441	1369	63%	Presumption

5.15 Again this supports the needs for an uplift to the LHN figure.

e) Unmet Need

5.16 Nowhere in the Regulation 18 Plan is there any reference to the Duty To Cooperate (DtC) or its potential successor and its implications for the overall housing requirement. This is in our opinion a major omission in the light of the reasons behind the withdrawal of the previous Local Pan Review.

5.17 The Reg 18 Plan acknowledges at para 5.3.24 that two HMA's exert an influence on the Borough, the West Kent HMA which encompasses Sevenoaks/Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells and falls across the north-western, south-western, and south-eastern parts of the Borough; and the Maidstone HMA which falls across the north-eastern and eastern parts of the Borough. In addition para 4.2.15 acknowledges that in determining the quantum options, the Council need to be mindful of the influence of these two HMA's and that neighbouring authorities are facing similar challenges to addressing their assessed needs. It fails however to demonstrate how these issues have been / will be addressed, and where the Council are in their discussions with the affected authorities.

5.18 As set out above the West Kent HMA encompasses the 3 least affordable Boroughs/ Districts in the County, and whilst TWBC are now relatively advanced with their LP Review, with the Inspectors report due imminently, the Inspectors findings on matters such as the housing requirement and the deliverability of the supply have still to be confirmed. At the other end of the spectrum, Sevenoaks have only recently started work on their new Local Pan Review (LPR) following their failed challenge of the Inspectors recommendation that their previous LPR was unsound, in part because of its failure to address the DtC.

5.19 Whilst para 5.3.26 of the Reg 18 Plan acknowledges that: *'Given the influences of the two HMAs across our borough, it is important that we continue to engage, in an active and on-going basis, with our neighbouring authorities so that we can understand this issue better and how it can be tackled in a reasonable, consistent, and sustainable way that meets the expectations of national policy'* the failure of the Reg 18 Plan and its associated evidence base to demonstrate constructive and ongoing engagement with neighbouring authorities from the earliest stages of this Draft Plan, particularly in relation to housing needs for those authorities that share a HMA is a fundamental flaw in the plan. A point exacerbated by the commentary in section 3.4 of the Green Belt Assessment which highlights both the need to liaise with Maidstone, Tunbridge Wells and Sevenoaks to see if they could take some of TMBC's need given the implications delivery has on the GB/AONB; and the fact that *'the requirement to demonstrate that growth cannot be accommodated by neighbouring boroughs has not yet been fully explored and evidenced'*.

5.20 It is in our opinion imperative given the housing needs of the West Kent HMA that the TMBC LPR addresses the issue of the housing needs of the wider HMA, the extent to which any requests to help meet unmet needs has been made and whether TMBC themselves have looked to others to assist them. Only through a rigorous approach to the issue of the DtC will the Council be able to demonstrate that its housing requirement is right and that the spatial strategy is correct in its approach to growth, including the release of GB sites and land within the AONB. To this end the SA should, in order to justify the Councils end approach, test various reasonable alternatives that consider the issue of unmet need and how this could be addressed through the plan. Likewise it's important that the plan encompasses evidence of effective and on-going joint working with neighbouring authorities on the issue of unmet need, both those within the same HMA, and those beyond who may be less effected by issues associated with the removal of land from the Green Belt and major development in the AONB.



---

**User Response: Text**

5.21 As things currently stand and cognisant of the situation in Sevenoaks (whose LPR is due to be published this autumn and whose ability to meet its LHN has yet to be clarified), and Maidstone (who are currently at examination, but struggling to meet their current LHN and have as a result a negative position in terms of their 5 year Housing Land Supply position), and Gravesham (who with the exception of Gravesend are wholly within the Metropolitan Green Belt and will not be able to meet their needs wholly within their urban areas); and not forgetting the continued issue of London's unmet need, we believe there is a clear and justifiable reason for the LHN figure to be increased to address the potential unmet needs of adjacent authorities.

f) A Buffer

5.22 As set out above it appears that the Council has tested a scenario within its spatial strategy that provides sufficient housing supply to meet the minimum LHN plus up to 10%. As drafted the Reg 18 plan does not provide any detailed information on the makeup of the supply. Table 2 merely sets out the component parts i.e. extant permissions, windfall allowances and scale of allocations to be made. Whilst we will return to the matter of windfalls below, as far as proposed allocations are concerned we are not able to test their deliverability/ the numbers relied upon in the housing trajectory as they are as yet unknown. We do however note that Para 4.2.15 of the Reg 18 Plan acknowledges that given the time horizon of the plan (to 2040), the Council should consider the need for flexibility to be built into the strategy so that it can be resilient to unforeseen changes that may occur during the latter years of the plan period.

5.23 Given the issues of affordability, affordable housing need, past under delivery and the DTC as identified above, all of which have a material impact on LHN, it is considered that at the very least a buffer should be built into the housing requirement for the Plan. Introducing a buffer into the housing requirement would ensure that the Council plans positively for the future in a manner that not only meets the LHN but also provides an uplift to reflect the acute affordability problem and in turn the rising affordable housing need in the Borough.

g) Conclusions on the Housing Requirement

5.24 Whilst recognising that TMBC has worked from the correct starting point, which is the LHN calculated by reference to the Standard Method i.e. 839 dpa, PPG is clear in that the LHN is only the starting point.

5.25 There are a range of factors relevant to the calculation of the housing requirement for the Draft Plan that TMBC needs to consider when arriving at its overall housing requirement. These include

- The severe and worsening affordability issue and the increasingly eye-watering affordability ratios;
- The poor levels of affordable housing delivery, and attendant increasing need for affordable homes; and
- The importance of including a buffer above the LHN to ensure adequate housing delivery particularly given the Council's poor track record of delivery as set out above.

5.26 When these factors are properly scrutinised they demonstrate clear and rational reasons as to why there should be an uplift to the LHN. The 10% suggested in the plan does not go far enough. Having regard to the above Redrow believe that at the very least the plan should provide for the LHN + a 20% buffer to ensure the Plan proceeds on a robust footing. This would lead to an annual housing requirement of 1,007 dpa. Setting the housing requirement at this level would significantly improve the affordability situation within the Borough and would deliver more affordable homes for those members of the community in the most need.

5.27 Unfortunately as TMBC has not tested any scenario above the LHN in terms of requirement, only supply so it is not in a position to determine whether an uplift of 20% could be achieved or not. Equally, if the higher level scenario advocated above cannot be accommodated within the Borough TMBC could then explore through the DtC, or successor alignment policy, whether any of its neighbours could assist, which is of course another important area of work that TMBC has not done.

Due to the capped nature of the housing need, to provide a buffer to ensure delivery of need, due to the acute affordability and affordable housing needs in the borough, and to potentially assist with meeting wider housing needs under the DtC.

---

**User Response: Text**

The requirement of delivering 839 dpa should be clearly recognised as a minimum requirement as set out at paragraph 11b of the NPPF which states, “strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing”. Thus, in ensuring the 839 dpa or indeed 923 dpa is a minimum (+10%), this will provide the basis to allow affordability to improve across the Borough which currently sits at 13.39 (property price to earnings ratio). The Council therefore needs to do everything it can to ensure the target used is the minimum and that there is “a sufficient supply and mix of sites” (NPPF, paragraph 68) allocated which are deliverable across the Plan period to improve affordability. This is vital.

Paragraph 11a) of the Framework requires all plans to promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to meet the identified needs of the area; whilst 11b) confirms that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other needs, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas. Furthermore, the Government has an objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, as set out in paragraph 60 of the Framework, and therefore sufficient amounts and variety of land must be available to meet specific needs.

Tonbridge and Malling has a need of 839 dwellings per annum across the plan period up to 2040. In order to be found a sound plan, it must be positively prepared and provide a strategy which seeks to meet the area’s assessed needs, as a minimum (paragraph 35a)) of the Framework. Tonbridge and Malling, at March 2020, could demonstrate a housing land supply of just 2.93 years, which is chronically low against the 5-year requirement.

Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and paragraph 24 of the Framework has a requirement for local planning authorities to maintain effective cooperation, the therefore Council has to demonstrate a Duty to Cooperate with neighbouring authorities of strategic matters to maximise the effectiveness of the activity of plan preparation and this includes ensuring unmet need in the neighbouring housing market areas / authorities is positively planned for.

The Council have previously withdrawn a failed Local Plan (July 2021) due to the failure of legal compliance to meet the Duty to Cooperate. As confirmed in paragraph 12 of the Inspectors’ Report (June 2021 – ED83) in respect of the failed Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council Local Plan, Sevenoaks District Council has an unmet housing need. Sevenoaks is a neighbouring local authority, falling within the West Kent Housing Market Area, alongside a large proportion of Tonbridge and Malling Borough.

There is a risk that some allocated sites are not deliverable within the plan period and / or the quantum of development is overestimated. As such, and in order to ensure the need is met in full, the additional 10% could address those sites that are not developed.

Question 5 invites views on whether the Local Plan should “as a minimum provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, including retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses”, consistent with NPPF paragraph 11(b), or whether the Plan should propose a 10% increase above the minimum level.

Vistry maintain that there is a clear case for exceeding the minimum Standard Method-derived housing figure, as set out in ‘Option B’. Indeed, the supply of new homes in the Borough has historically been constrained by the prevalence of the Green Belt, and other designations. This has led to recognised impacts, such as suppressed household formation and worsening levels of housing affordability, with associated socio-economic consequences.

The latest Office for National Statistics (ONS) dataset indicates that the median house price affordability ratio for the Borough was 13.39 in 2021. By comparison, the 2021 affordability ratio for England and Wales was 8.93. A similar pattern is reflected in lower quartile affordability ratios, with the 2021 figure for Tonbridge and Malling being 13.17, compared to 7.85 across England and Wales as a whole.

Relative levels of housing affordability are further considered in the Housing Needs Survey (2022) which forms part of the evidence base for the consultation. At Table 3.7, this document confirms that housing within Tonbridge and Malling is amongst the least affordable in Kent, with median (workplace-based) affordability ratios only being higher in neighbouring Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells.

---

**User Response: Text**

At paragraphs 5.3 of the Housing Needs Survey, it is confirmed that gross affordable needs equate to 753 dwellings per annum (dpa), with a net shortfall of 283 dpa being identified, when taking account of the projected supply of affordable rental accommodation and new-build commitments. Notwithstanding the absence of a Viability Assessment at this stage, it is nonetheless unlikely that simply increasing the percentage of affordable housing required from each major development is likely to address this shortfall.

Therefore, it is essential that the Plan increases the supply of housing overall (to levels well above the Standard Method minimum figure) to facilitate additional affordable provision and to achieve meaningful progress towards redressing the general affordability issues facing the Borough.

Such over-provision is also vital to provide flexibility and choice in the supply of new homes. Indeed, as the Consultation Document sets out (at paragraph 4.2.15), the two distinct HMAs exert an influence across the Borough. Likewise, neighbouring authorities are facing similar challenges in seeking to address their objectively assessed needs. The Plan therefore must make provision for significant levels of new supply within both HMAs, in order to address 'real-world' market dynamics. This is likely to justify a higher growth approach, essentially increasing the housing requirement to levels over and above the minimum Standard Method figure.

Furthermore, it must be noted that the dated nature of the current Core Strategy (adopted 2007) and the Development Land Allocations DPD (adopted 2008), together with the failure of the previously submitted Local Plan at Examination, has prevented the Plan-led release of Green Belt land. This means that the supply of new homes has not increased as it otherwise would have. Constraints to housing supply are borne out in comparatively low average rates of housing delivery over the preceding five years (591 dpa).

Indeed, the latest Housing Delivery Test (HDT) score for Tonbridge and Malling (published January 2022) was just 63%. For comparison, and as noted in a report to the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board (meeting 01 March 2022), only 8% of LPAs nationwide achieved a HDT measurement lower than that in Tonbridge and Malling. Consequently, for the purposes of calculating five-year housing land supply (5YHLS), a 20% buffer is currently applied to the requirement.

It is important then that the new Local Plan addresses the historic and ongoing shortfall in housing provision within the Borough, and takes steps to markedly improve the supply of new market and affordable homes. Vistry considers that Option B is clearly preferable to Option A. However, in view of the concerns raised, it is concerning that higher uplifts (i.e., exceeding 10%) were not considered within the consultation document, the Interim SA, or the wider evidence base.

Furthermore, it is evident that a quantum of unmet housing need is again at risk of arising within the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells (West Kent) HMA. As noted, Sevenoaks District Council is about to consult on a Regulation 18 'Issues and Options' Local Plan, that does not firmly commit to meeting objectively assessed needs in full. Likewise, the Submission Version Tunbridge Wells Local Plan (which is currently at Examination) does not propose to accommodate any unmet need.

The current TMBC Consultation Document is silent on the question of unmet need within the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells (West Kent) HMA, and nor does the evidence base provide substantive comment. This is most concerning, given the comments of the Inspectors examining the previously submitted TMBC Local Plan, who stated at paragraph 33 of their report that;

"The identified need for housing exists now, and the likely existence of unmet need has been known about for some time and is therefore a strategic matter that should have been considered through the DtC in the current round of local plans, not delayed to some future date. Deferring the issue to subsequent plans does not amount to constructive, active engagement, especially when the plan making processes were, in reality, closely aligned."

Consequently, it is crucial that the Local Plan and SA test options that would result in the Plan fully meeting the need for both market and affordable homes, in addition to potentially accommodating unmet needs arising within the wider Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA. This is essential, both as a matter of sound planning and to address the Duty-to-Cooperate.

Again, Vistry make these points in the context of previously stated concerns regarding the limited scope of future Local

---

**User Response: Text**

Plan consultations. Progressing from this high-level 'Issues and Options' style of consultation directly to the Regulation 19 Stage, effectively curtails the transparent consideration of options beyond those currently presented.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

Reluctantly accepting Option 1, I believe that the assessed need is already too high – it is based on out-of-date pre 2014 population figures and makes no allowance for changes brought about by Covid and Brexit. The Borough is already overcrowded. This addition will lead to more stress on already overstretched local services such as healthcare and education, and more congestion on the roads into and around Tonbridge.

My preferred quantum option is **OPTION 3**

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

We should be building **only** for international migration, for affordable housing, for a sustainable amount of growth and/or replacing poor, existing housing.

QUANTUM 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

Just meet local housing need, not 50% for market housing and developer profit.

No more encroachment of the Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation outlines two options for housing growth based on the target set out in

**User Response: Text**

the draft plan of delivering 15,941 dwellings by meeting the Assess Housing Need (Option A), or meeting the Assess Housing Need plus up to a 10% buffer (Option B) which would assist in meeting housing short fall.

Housing delivery is a national issue and TMBC has an important role to play in facilitating the delivery of new homes balanced with economic growth to supply housing land and job creation that meets the needs of the local community.

The previous TMBC Local Plan (Regulation 22 Submission dated January 2019) was submitted under the 'transitional period' lasting for six months after the publication of the July 2018 NPPF within which any draft Local Plan submitted to the Secretary of State was able to proceed using the locally derived housing need figures, which outlined a lower overall housing requirement for TMBC.

This had resulted in TMBC accelerating its Local Plan preparation period. One of the tests of soundness considered at examination stage is whether the plan is "positively prepared". This means that a Local Plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. During the course of the examination process of the previous draft Local Plan, the Inspectors were minded that the Plan failed to meet the tests of soundness on the basis that the Local Plan failed to adequately assess the housing need for the borough alongside a failure to engage with neighbouring authorities to address the shortfall in housing provision under the duty to cooperate. The Inspectors were the view that the housing targets outlined in the previous draft Local Plan achieved a shortfall in provision of c. 21% against the objectively assessed need (OAN).

The Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation makes reference that the objectively assessed need for housing for the borough across the plan period is 15,941 dwellings, which equate to 839 dwellings per annum. It is unclear whether the targets outlined in the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation are reflective of current shortfall in delivery. At present, the TMBC Housing Delivery Test results for 2021 indicate that Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council was able to deliver only 63% of the housing required between the period from 2019-2021, which follows a shortfall in provision in the preceding periods. Therefore, it is considered and requested that the housing targets contained in the new Local Plan should meeting the Assess Housing Need plus a 10% buffer to ensure that delivery in the borough adequately addresses the housing need of the borough. This would also ensure that the Local Plan would be prepared robustly to meet the test of soundness.

Quantum option 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"

What are your reasons for selecting this particular quantum option ?

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

*- Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"*

**There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere**

I selected Quantum 1 as I see no reason to exceed the onerous housing targets set by the current government in the South East

---

**User Response: Text**

Concentration must be focused on assessed needs. Otherwise further traffic congestion would here have an overall negative impact on climate change. It would also create a higher land take for green field sites.

No more housing than necessary

- None of the options are supported as each assumes expansion of Kings Hill
- Kings Hill should remain within the confines of its airbase brownfield site as per previous plans.
- Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the coalescence of communities.
- No building on valuable green spaces within existing areas should be considered as they are too valuable to the local population. NPPF Green Space Policy ref 99 states that “Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings should not be built on.”
- We believe the development of brownfield is preferable to destroying open countryside, valuable farmland and green spaces.

We strongly support the Council’s position at paragraph 5.3.18 of the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation Document that the “only reasonable approach” would be to meet the assessed need for housing in full, and that this would be the “minimum position”.

While we would support Option B Quantum 2 over Option A Quantum 1, on the basis that it would allow for greater flexibility and resilience in meeting housing needs across the Plan period. We are concerned that Option B would still be insufficient.

Concerns remain because the assessed housing need is the minimum number of homes that the council should be seeking to deliver, and we note that the ‘uncapped’ Standard Method figure includes a 59% uplift, reflecting significant affordability issues across the Borough. An uplift greater than 10% of assessed housing need would therefore likely be required to address affordability issues. In addition, we would be concerned that a 10% uplift would not be sufficient to address any unmet need arising from London or neighbouring authorities.

We therefore suggest that meeting assessed housing need plus a figure than 10% plus should be considered by the Council.

BAG cannot justify supporting any of the options offered on the basis that in each there is an assumption of expanding, in particular, Kings Hill which was always intended to be a development which remained within the confines of its airbase brownfield site. Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the inevitable coalescence of communities.

As a principal however, BAG believes the development of brownfield as preferable to destroying open countryside and valuable farmland.

The south east economy is already at breaking point, TMBC also have a large area of Green Belt so restricts the land availability.

---

**User Response: Text**

The target area already includes +10% so why do we need more? Why is there not an option to reject government figures and look elsewhere as part of the levelling up strategy.

Kings Hill is already over developed and considerably more than the original plans. The original plan to have 40% given to green space has been disregarded and ignored.

Focus development in and adjacent to settlements beyond outer greenbelt boundary and outside of the AONBs.

Infrastructure is already over-crowded/struggling. The recent proposal from KC to reduce bus services are unhelpful.

The number of houses required should be challenged first before including additional numbers.

If done properly. If your housing need assessment is based upon modelling then this needs to be regarded with scepticism. What error margins have been incorporated? What type of Monte Carlo analysis has been used?

QUANTUM 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration".

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

Quantum 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration".

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

The local plan is already based on a very large increase in dwellings

- None of the options are supported as each assumes expansion of Kings Hill
- Kings Hill should remain within the confines of its airbase brownfield site as per previous plans.
- Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the coalescence of communities.
- No building on valuable green spaces within existing areas should be considered as they are too valuable to the local population. NPPF Green Space Policy ref 99 states that "Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings should not be built on."
- We believe the development of brownfield is preferable to destroying open countryside, valuable farmland and green spaces.

**QUANTUM 3 [Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"]**

There is no sense in wasting land, building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere and encouraging commuters to the area.

---

**User Response: Text**

We commend the Council in considering a higher level of housing over the plan period – there are a number of sound planning reasons why this is appropriate, whereas the alternative of constraining the amount of new housing will exacerbate the acute affordability issues that are prevalent in the Borough.

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas to prevent neighbouring towns / villages merging into one another to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

- None of the options are supported as each assumes expansion of Kings Hill
- Kings Hill should remain within the confines of its airbase brownfield site as per previous plans.
- Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the coalescence of communities.
- No building on valuable green spaces within existing areas should be considered as they are too valuable to the local population. NPPF Green Space Policy ref 99 states that “Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings should not be built on.”
- We believe the development of brownfield is preferable to destroying open countryside, valuable farmland and green spaces.

My preferred quantum option is **OPTION 3**.

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

We should be building **only** for international migration, for affordable housing, for a sustainable amount of growth and/or replacing poor, existing housing.

Any development must be based on reasonable assumptions; many previous norms are no longer valid post pandemic, for example that of the primacy of London dictating working and travelling habits.

Given the quantity of houses built in this part of Kent over the past 15-20 years and the resultant demonstration of inadequate infrastructure, particularly roads, there can be no reasonable argument to plan for more than the minimum that would satisfy Government edict.

Firstly, with reference to the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, Option A [=Quantum 1] generally has more ‘significant’ (higher) positive and less harmful negative scores, than Option B [=Quantum 2]. Therefore, based on this high-level sustainability scoring, Option A should be taken forward. Secondly, in consideration of the existing Green Belt constraints, with over 70% of the Borough comprising land having a protected Green Belt designation, this should support the adoption of Option A (Quantum 1); as housing need alone is unlikely to outweigh the harm (as noted above in Q4). Furthermore, this fact could help justify the adoption of a lower housing target, which would more likely achieve sustainable development, given the local circumstances, and cause less harm. Lastly, it is widely acknowledged that the ‘standard method’ overestimates housing need, based on the out-dated 2014 Office for National Statistics (ONS) projected growth. Thus, the case should be made for adopting a housing need based on the more realistic and up-dated figures (e.g. 2018). The difference between the 2014 and 2018 figures, at a national level, equates to about a 50% reduction in the actual housing need (i.e. from 300,000/year, for 2014, to only “164,000”/year2). Therefore, it might be reasonable to assume that a similar (50%) reduction could realistically be



---

**User Response: Text**

applied in our Borough, significantly reducing the need to develop any green field sites.

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge’s geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

**Which spatial strategy option do you prefer? OPTION 1, but there is a case for Option 4, in that every rural community needs some housing**

**What are your reasons for selecting this spatial strategy option? Greenbelt is and AONB are protected areas for a reason it is not a reusable commodity – there are biodiversity unique environments of nature. At a time where climate change is at the forefront for most countries, UK are getting rid of vast areas of trees and natural habitat to make way for more houses. Green areas are not only good from an ecological viewpoint but also from a mental health viewpoint.**

**Once Greenbelt is gone, it is gone forever, and Greenbelt's main use is openness and to prevent "Coalescence of Settlements" we don't want villages to sprawl into each other, we want them to remain separate and unique villages. If you build on greenbelt, planting shrubs and trees will not replace the biodiverse environment that bugs, insects, animals, reptiles, birds have taken 100s of years to create.**

This is a forced choice because the plan is using out-of-date (pre 2014) population figures. It does not consider changes resulting from Brexit and Covid since then. Without accurate data, there will be unnecessary development into areas of essential wetlands and greenbelt that absorbs CO2, provides wildlife habits and prevent the town from flooding. Skilful and high- quality development and refurbishment of existing buildings and brownfield areas could provide additional housing while preserving greenbelt and wetlands.

Additionally, due to Tonbridge’s geography it is not possible to build additional road infrastructure to reduce traffic, which is already congested.

- None of the options are supported as each assumes expansion of Kings Hill
- Kings Hill should remain within the confines of its airbase brownfield site as per previous plans.
- Any further expansion would intrude upon valuable natural assets and contribute to the coalescence of communities.
- No building on valuable green spaces within existing areas should be considered as they are too valuable to the local population. NPPF Green Space Policy ref 99 states that “Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings should not be built on.”
- We believe the development of brownfield is preferable to destroying open countryside, valuable farmland and green spaces.

---

**User Response: Text**

Kings Hill has already provided enough dwellings over last 20 years to meet Government targets.

It protects our cherished Green Belt, and AONB, Tonbridge area is saturated with cars/peoples/schools - build on brown belt areas near transport links.

Any development must be based on reasonable assumptions; many previous norms are no longer valid post pandemic, for example that of the primacy of London dictating working and travelling habits

T&M Council has not fully met housing need for at least 30 years plus. To attempt to meet it in full by 2040 would be a nightmare scenario

I understand that the target already includes +/-10% so no further increase is necessary. Also, apparently there was a penalty 20% uplift following the previous plan's withdrawal.  
Kings Hill has already been developed beyond original expectations, especially regarding the approval of the amount of green space area that should remain within the airfield.

Quantum 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration".

You are talking about destroying greenbelt land to build houses for people who already have houses!

TMBC have to include in the Plan for growth until 2040. With the growing population, in terms of numbers of people, exacerbated by the ageing population, the 10% (as you have only put forward two options) is a value TMBC feel is appropriate, hence my response, but if the scientific data shows +7%, or +17%, whatever, that surely is the figure that should be used.

Question 5 invites views on whether the Local Plan should '...as a minimum provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, including retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses...', consistent with NPPF paragraph 11(b), or whether the Plan should propose a 10% increase above the minimum level.

We would firmly argue that there is in fact a clear basis upon which the Council should be seeking to exceed the minimum Standard Method-derived housing figure, as set out in 'Option B'. Indeed, the supply of new homes in the Borough has historically been constrained by the prevalence of the Green Belt, and other designations. This has led to recognised impacts, including suppressed household formation, worsening levels of housing affordability, etc., with associated socio-economic consequences.

The latest Office for National Statistics (ONS) dataset indicates that the median house price affordability ratio for the Borough was 13.39 in 2021. By comparison, the 2021 affordability ratio for England and Wales stands at 9.1. A similar pattern is reflected in lower quartile affordability ratios, with the 2021 figure for Tonbridge and Malling Borough being 13.17, compared to 7.85 across England and Wales as a whole.

Relative levels of housing affordability are further considered in the Housing Needs Survey (2022) which forms part of the evidence base for the Consultation Document. At Table 3.7, this document confirms that housing within the Borough is

---

**User Response: Text**

amongst the least affordable in Kent, with median (workplace-based) affordability ratios only being higher in neighbouring Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells.

At paragraphs 5.3 of the Housing Needs Survey, it is confirmed that gross affordable needs equate to 753 dwellings per annum (dpa), with a net shortfall of 283 dpa being identified, when taking account of the projected supply of affordable rental accommodation and new-build commitments. Notwithstanding the absence of a Viability Assessment at this stage, it is nonetheless unlikely that simply increasing the percentage of affordable housing required from each major development is likely to address this shortfall.

It is essential therefore that the Plan increases the supply of housing overall (to levels well above the Standard Method minimum figure) to facilitate both additional affordable provision and to make a meaningful inroad to redressing the general affordability issues facing the Borough's communities.

Such over-provision is also vital to provide flexibility and choice in the supply of new homes. Indeed, as the Consultation Document sets out (at paragraph 4.2.15), the two distinct HMAs exert an influence across the Borough. Likewise, neighbouring authorities are facing similar challenges in seeking to addressing their objectively assessed needs. The Plan must therefor make provision for significant levels of new supply within both HMAs, to address the 'real-world' market dynamics. This is likely to justify a higher growth approach essentially increasing the housing requirement to levels over and above the minimum standard method figure.

Furthermore, it needs to be noted that the Borough's latest Housing Delivery Test (HDT) score (published January 2022) was just 63%. For comparison, and as noted in a report to the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board (meeting 1st March 2022), only 8% of LPAs nationwide achieved a HDT measurement lower than that in Tonbridge and Malling Borough. Consequently, for the purposes of calculating five-year housing land supply (5YHLS), a 20% buffer is currently applied to the requirement.

It is important then that the new Local Plan addresses the historic and ongoing shortfall in housing provision within the Borough and takes steps to markedly improve the supply of new market and affordable homes. And delivery of this be focussed in the early part of the plan period. Taking all this into consideration, BDW considers that Option B is clearly preferable to Option A. However, in view of the above concerns, it is concerning that higher uplifts (i.e., exceeding 10%) have not been considered within the consultation document, the Interim SA, or the wider evidence base.

Furthermore, it is evident that a quantum of unmet housing need is again at risk of arising within the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells (West Kent) HMA. As noted, Sevenoaks District Council is about to consult on a Regulation 18 Issues and Options Local Plan, which does not firmly commit to meeting objectively assessed needs in full. Likewise, the Submission Version Tunbridge Wells Local Plan does not propose to accommodate any unmet need.

The current TMBC Consultation Document is silent on the question of unmet need within the Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells (West Kent) HMA, and nor does the evidence base provide substantive comment. This is most concerning, given the comments of the Inspectors examining the previously submitted TMBC Local Plan, who stated at paragraph 33 of their report that:

*'The identified need for housing exists now, and the likely existence of unmet need has been known about for some time and is therefore a strategic matter that should have been considered through the DtC in the current round of local plans, not delayed to some future date. Deferring the issue to subsequent plans does not amount to constructive, active engagement, especially when the plan making processes were, in reality, closely aligned.'*

Consequently, it is crucial the Local Plan and SA test options that would result in the Plan fully meeting the need for both

---

**User Response: Text**

market and affordable homes, in addition to potentially accommodating unmet needs arising within the wider Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells HMA.

This is essential, both as a matter of sound planning and to address the Duty-to-Cooperate.

Again, we make these points in the context of previously stated concerns regarding the limited scope of future Local Plan consultations. Progressing from this high-level Issues and Options style of consultation directly to the Regulation 19 Stage, effectively curtails the transparent consideration of options beyond those currently presented.

Greenbelt is sacrosanct, it is not a reuseable commodity - once it has gone, that is forever

Quantum 3 Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

With the choice that I have I have to go with Option A which I believe is based on out of date population figures anyway. There is definitely insufficient infrastructure to support this. We are already overstretched and overcrowded.

**QUANTUM 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"**

**There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere**

**QUANTUM 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"**

*There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere*

Quantum 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration".

We do not need to waste more precious building land one homes for people who already have one.

Quantum 3 - Housing needs MINUS 50% no allowances for "Internal Migration"

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

QUANTUM 3 - Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

**User Response: Text**

Quantum 3 - *Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"*

Quantum 3

**Why do we need extra 50% for internal migration?**

Quantum 3 -- *Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"*

***There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere***

My preferred quantum option is **OPTION 3 - *Housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"***

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere.

We should be building **only** for international migration, for affordable housing, for a sustainable amount of growth and/or replacing poor, existing housing.

Should be based on actual local need rather than government-imposed target

Quantum 3 - housing needs MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

QUANTUM 3 - housing need MINUS 50%, no allowance for "Internal Migration"

There is no sense in wasting land building houses to attract people who already have houses elsewhere

Because option A already imposes more construction activity than would be desirable during the period.

I understand that the target already includes +/-10% so no further increase is necessary. Also, apparently there was a penalty 20% uplift following the previous plan's withdrawal. Kings Hill has already been developed beyond original expectations, especially regarding the approval of the amount of green space area that should remain within the airfield.

Do not need to build housing for those who already have a house.

Option A - meeting assessed housing need on the understanding that the housing stock created is local people to own or rent not for speculators.

---

**User Response: Text**

Any development must be based on reasonable assumptions; many previous norms are no longer valid post pandemic, for example that of the primacy of London dictating working and travelling habits.

If only two options then we must go with 'only meeting assessed housing need' - i.e. Option 1. It is evident that, even if not included in the new Local Plan, then extra development will take place as it always does with reference to special circumstances of some kind. Additionally, we draw attention to our comments associated with Q 11, below.

Having stated the above, we are disappointed that there was not an Option 3 for the Local Plan to return to the assessed quantum need prior to the penalty 20% uplift following the previous plan's withdrawal, or even an Option 4 to reject the Government figures entirely.

BAG strongly urges TMBC to continue challenging the Government's assessment of housing needs as mentioned in Matt Boughton's Foreword to the new plan.

BAG also highlights the fact that the West Malling area has already borne a disproportionate amount of new housing in the last 20 years. Here follows an extract of a 2022 report compiled for BAG regarding local housing developments:

'... the increase in housing in the immediate vicinity of West Malling; that is within a 1 mile radius, the number of dwellings has increased by 3695. Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council covers a 93 square mile area, of which the area surrounding West Malling (including Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange) accounts for 1% of the geographical space of the borough. However, this very small area has absorbed roughly 58% of the number of new dwellings and the associated increase in demand on local services; destruction of natural habitat and green spaces that this entails'.

The MGB round Tonbridge meets all the requirements specified in the NPPF i.e. To safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

Meet needs in certain areas according to infrastructure

Answer: I selected Quantum 1 as I see no reason to exceed the onerous housing targets set by the current government in the South East

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:10:51. Total records: 794

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 11] What are your reasons for selecting these partic...

### User Response: Text

The south east is being asked to shoulder too much of the Government's housing targets and it will take courage to push back and protect our countryside. Do you have the balls to protect the Garden of England and our valuable countryside or are you happy to roll over and continue to destroy it for profit?

have a look at the congestion on the A228 leading south from Kings Hill, or wander along Milton Lane, Hazen Road or Queen Street. Our roads are chockablock with cars. When you build 3500 homes you have to build roads to allow the residents to get from A to B. The plan suggests more homes, with more cars and no new roads. Parking on narrow estate roads, often privately made to the narrowest possible standard is dangerous. Simply saying one house, one space is crass to say the least and has the potential to ghettoise large parts of new build estates.

The effects of climate change must be central to any development in the borough. Southern Water should not be extracting water from rivers at times of drought, and a plan to build reservoirs to serve existing communities should be a priority before any new housing is built.

The Green Belt should not be developed where brownfield sites are available. Once the countryside is concreted over, it is lost forever. The country needs to keep land available for farming, as part of our food security, and for the provision of solar and wind generation.

Greater thought is needed on the type of housing that is most needed in the borough. Do we need more bungalows for retirees near urban hubs (freeing up family homes), social housing near main sources of employment or flats in Tonbridge for rail commuters to London?

Make what we have more useful and beautiful for existing residents, protect the green space and the environment

Climate Change is real. Weather is more extreme and will become increasingly so with real effects on the way we live eg resultant flooding, effect on crops, changes in social behaviour. Living will be harder and values will change. To describe a development as a positive impact on greenhouse gases just because it is within 800m of a train station is ludicrous. How many people will never use a car?

There are many other factors to be considered eg the loss of green space for carbon capture and food production, the impact of concreting over rain-absorbent earth, the production and use of concrete. There are also issues of mental health connected to having access to nature as evidenced through lockdown. This is not access to small pockets of green park in the middle of a housing development, but access to fields which are alive with wild flowers, insects, birds and wildlife.

Minimising greenhouse gas emissions should be number 1 priority for everyone

I think these matters will be down-graded in the search for places to build housing. They are, to me, essential to the well-being of residents

Alongside new homes it is essential that appropriate transport, community facilities and infrastructure are planned for to ensure there is capacity for growth. However, a balance between all the strategic matters needs to be found.

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate change is and will continue to be a key factor in the lives of local people and is linked to the need to restore and protect the natural environment  
Saving areas of Green belt is important for the health and well being of our towns and villages

Tonbridge has been neglected for too long with a lack of policy protection against poorly designed developments; the absence of up to date landscape character appraisals is also to the detriment of the town centre. Tonbridge deserves much better and should be a high priority for the focus of the new local plan, where high quality designed homes can be provided to help support the high street's shops and services, alongside significant improvement to the road network which is often congested. Areas of high landscape character around Tonbridge must be recognised and safeguarded.

Climate change is the most important issue facing us at the moment.  
A community with good community facilities and infrastructure is soulless.  
To facilitate community life in the borough, there needs to be good transport infrastructure, especially for active travel and public transport.

Community facilities for existing residents seem to come secondary to creating new homes to squeeze more new residents in.

The natural environment and existing built and historic environments already exist and need looking after (this will also help with the climate change aspect, incidentally). When you lose them, or their character, they are gone forever.

The increasing impact of automation, digital connectivity, remote working, electric and self-driving cars etc, is still to be understood. The UK, it's working and living habits and infrastructure needs are likely to look very different within the timeframe that this plan is expected to encompass.

Whilst fulfilling the future housing requirements, it is equally important to preserve greenbelt and open spaces for the sake of both physical and mental well-being of those occupying them. Well designed housing that takes into considerations climate change and sustainability

We need everything going forwards to be sustainable and geared to the current climate crisis. Development of new and existing housing, businesses etc needs to be around this key criteria and as part of this to specifically also intentionally and urgently improve and support public transport , thereby reducing the need for more roads and carparking. Accommodation, school, work, shop all accessible locally via cheap public transport, thus growing the local economy.

All important to prevent urban sprawl

Local plan considers such nonsense as climate change (duh) etc, should be more focused on conserving what's left of our green and pleasant land

We should not build on green field sites

borough needs infrastructure before plan implemented



---

**User Response: Text**

I think the most important aspects we need to consider is protecting our environment and not ruining all our much needed green spaces. And ensuring there are quality community facilities and infrastructure, such as doctors, dentists, hospitals, schools. Currently there are too many houses, not enough parking, and not enough facilities for the people already living here. But as always I think houses will take priority as it generates a lot of money for those in key positions, and facilities will not be considered. So there will remain a shortage. And worse these will be built on greenbelt land and areas of outstanding natural beauty because somebody will make more money on them. For goodness sake, please consider what you're doing to the quality of life for those of us living here.

Green Belt – is critical for preventing settlement coalescence, protecting biodiversity and sustainability

Community Facilities & Infrastructure – the current facilities (doctor surgeries / school buses / dentists etc) are insufficient to meet current demand nevermind adding additional burden. Parking is also a significant issue in areas such as Kings Hill.

Natural Environment –

Climate and environment are clearly of critical relevance; will more houses result in additional reservoirs being built to provide additional resource? Water is already a scarce resource in the South East and we can't build more houses without this being addressed first.

Building will clearly proceed, so things like this, adequate doctors, hospitals, police, fire services to support an ever growing population need to be factored in; all at a time that central government are asking departments to cut their budgets further.

Climate change should be at the top of all agendas being the most urgent to address. Green belt reduction will have the most impact on this but the needs of housing have to be balanced with this as population grows.

The plan must protect the identity and wellbeing of existing communities and ensure there is no further eroding of land and natural environment which currently keeps our historic unique rural villages and towns separated and provides natural wildlife corridors for numerous species.

We all need to live and travel in a sustainable way for the climate so public transport and flats rather than houses are preferable, with a sense of community.

Sustainable transport is essential

To create decent places for people to live with access to green space/natural environment as well as developing community through good planning and good local facilities

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces. GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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

---

### User Response: Text

setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The whole local plan is hideous when we have thousands of empty shops and office available for redevelopment. We leave a legacy of selfishness and financial priority to our children when we have the knowledge to make informed environmental decisions.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

- 1.Climate change will affect everyone and the scrutiny of the environmental impact of each proposed development must be given the highest priority.
- 2.Good community facilities and infrastructure are vital for the wellbeing of the population and must be the core requirement of any proposal.
- 3.Transport must be given a high priority and every opportunity to ensure the provision of good public transport and the discouragement of car use must be taken.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

---

### User Response: Text

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

1. Climate Change - fairly obvious.
2. Green Belt - we need open spaces.
3. We need to cherish our heritage or we are nothing.
4. We need somewhere to rejuvenate and exercise in the open air

I am assuming roads (both provision and maintenance) will be included in "Community facilities and infrastructure".

I believe these are the most important issues that we should be considering with Climate change at the top of the list.

You can't add more houses without a need to park cars for the residents and/or get them from home to work. Commuting in the Borough is a joke. Air Quality on the Borough is another farce. Public Transport subsidies are already in line to be reduced with the major bus providers running at a loss and therefore unable to provide useful commuter routes, particularly for schools. Less Green Belt will only enhance the damage done by increased traffic as less environment to offset carbon damage.

No new developments leave the area as it is. Peaceful in a beautiful countryside

By incorporating landscaping and the planning of new green spaces as part of public transport and the built and historic environment considerations you will automatically go some way to protecting the existing green belt.

The historic environment is central to tourism and the atmosphere of the area. Climate change is the biggest threat to our society. Community facilities and infrastructure are needed by everyone.

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Housing - essential and obvious

Community Facilities and infrastructure have a direct bearing on quality of life across all age groups and need to be reviewed and refreshed regularly in order to meet social and economic changes. These can include increases in working from home and greater demand for leisure facilities.

Green Belt Essential to stop urban spread and conurbation issues.

A thriving, well connected trio of communities surrounded by green space with a strong principle town to provide majority facilities would benefit everyone.

In the Medway Gap in particular, these strategic matters must be considered as priority. The current proposed Local Plan does not take these matters into account.

Health and the environment

Housing is what the local plan is all about achieving

The natural environment is vital because we all need clean air to breath, open spaces to enjoy, and trees and plants to soak up the CO2

Transport is the big problem at the moment. Congested roads and loss of bus services on which people depended

Meeting the local housing need as set by the standard method is the key priority facing TMBC. Alongside new homes it is essential that appropriate transport, community facilities and infrastructure are planned for to ensure there is capacity for growth. However, a balance between all the strategic matters needs to be found.

An ageing population needs to be able to travel by public transport to doctors and hospitals.

The Green Belt must be preserved above all else.

Protect the environment and any development should not impact adversely on existing communities.

Through building on underutilised brown field sites such as rail car parks and soon to be obsolete offices, housing can be provided without changing the green belt.

As TMBC have themselves said, the Government's housing target is unrealistically high so priority must be given to protecting and enhancing the environment in which we live.

---

**User Response: Text**

In any plan all these are linked but given 3 options I consider my selection are the ruling ones and will impinge on and possibly control the others.

Housing must be placed as near as possible to where it is required. At the strategic level the HMAs should each meet their own housing need.

Community facilities and infra structure are key to creating communities rather than sterile sad housing estates. These facilities must be created both to cater for new developments and to prevent the dilution of of existing facilities as more people use the few existing ones.

Transport is key to fine tuning the placing of housing to community facilities and jobs.

If you tackle these, you will build something longlasting. Houses and environments that can survive climate change. High environmental standards now will mean much less retro-fitting and regret later on.

Social housing will provide the level of housing needed whereas developers always cheat and wriggle out of cheaper housing commitments.

The district is a rural district we all love it as such if people want urban areas then there's affordable areas not too far. Save the countryside do not build on it

In an area of outstanding natural beauty is important that we we protect this for future generations

As above

The need for green space between major developments is clear, People come out from the towns to enjoy 'the countryside' with walking, cycling, visiting country pubs and general 'country lifestyle'. The developments attached to the rural villages and on farmland and woodland, as put forward in Option 4 and 5 will effectively remove these options by creating one large sprawl without addressing the needs of those wanting affordable housing due to lack to proximity to social infrastructure and of physical infrastructure.

We need to look after our natural environment and existing built and historic environments

Too much weight is given to climate change, green belt etc, when in reality people want new infrastructure built, roads, doctors, shops etc

Important to maintain the integrity and function of the Green Belt,

---

**User Response: Text**

Adequate infrastructure – particularly roads – is essential to accommodate new development

Economic development is needed to provide local jobs

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

I think focusing on a sustainable future for the area, county and country should be high priority or we risk wiping out all resources.

The current population needs better infrastructure to be a happy thriving community. Existing roads hospitals water etc are woefully inadequate and any development should at least pay for all the improvements needed.

To repurpose property that is unused that could offer housing. To improve public transport and the service infrastructure of the area. To improve facilities within current urban areas.

Whilst we all accept that more housing is required, I feel it is essential to support this with good transport links and access to healthcare etc.

Green Belt is also a significant feature of choosing where to live and should therefore be protected.

key to why people want to live here in the first place and to enable rural and semi rural community to maintain their identity

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

Unless every level of government and every individual works to manage climate change we will struggle to support a recognisable quality of life in 2040.

Supporting communities should be the guiding principle of all policy.

Enhancing the Natural Environment is necessary to sustain our way of life and crucial for health and well being and quality of life.

Everything else is important but lower down the hierarchy

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Lack of housing - and specifically affordable/social housing - is the number one priority. Transport and related infrastructure must be addressed alongside it. Buildings must be environmentally practical (new builds present the opportunity to do so by design.)

---

### User Response: Text

It is unreasonable to expect that we can just build new homes without thinking of the environment and the necessity to invest and not just build new homes without thought because the government imposes it upon us.

We need more affordable housing in lots of Kent but these need to be planned carefully around expanding local infrastructure (schools, GPs, roads, bus routes, safe cycle routes) to match. Often developments are created with little thought of the surrounding services. It tends to be one of the reasons cited by NIMBYs. If you cater for these elements too, there's little excuse for rejecting essential plans to grow.

All of this can't be at the expense of our natural environment so we'd need to ensure that things are built with this in mind. Large outdoor play spaces, wide roads for safe cycling, more GP services, expanded community centres, etc

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

safeguarding of the natural environment, minimising the effects of climate change and reducing emissions

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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



---

**User Response: Text**

assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Each of the three chosen strategic matters are dependent on the others.

Green belt needs to be protected for future generations and to prevent Kent from becoming a concrete county while presently we are just about managing to be the Garden of England.

Transport needs need to be addressed as the amount of traffic passing through TMBC to the rest of the country from Dover is extreme and only getting worse. The road infrastructure cannot cope and more housing will bring in more people thereby increasing traffic. The state of our roads is poor and getting worse.

Community facilities: we need more primary and secondary schools to allow students to go to school nearer their homes and prevent the multiple trips by cars, buses and trains to get children to their place of education. There are not enough doctor's surgeries and people are having great difficulty getting through by telephone to make an appointment let alone to actually see doctors face to face.

Infrastructure: Again, poor state of roads, not enough schools and doctor surgeries.

In the climate emergency we need a joined up approach, now.

Housing is important but only when supported by communities and the infrastructure that facilitates them.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY

---

**User Response: Text**

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

We are lucky in the area to have a good, active rural environment. There are benefits in terms of health, jobs, and climate change. However it is a resources that is easy to destroy. The priority should be to safeguard it for the future.

Green Belt: Preventing Urban sprawl is of great importance to me. Especially in Kent, where green belt land is often protecting the character of historic towns, and works to encourage redevelopment of disused industrial and urban land, rather than growing it.

Natural Environment: Maintaining biodiversity, local wildlife populations, and irreplaceable areas of natural beauty is of very great importance to me. We are very fortunate to live in such an environment and should protect it, it cannot be recovered once lost.

Agricultural production: I believe that local agricultural production is both sustainable, and necessary given the recent events in Ukraine highlighting the issues with reliance on external imports. I acknowledge that we cannot fully meet imports, however maintaining and growing a strong local base should be of high priority.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

NPPF objectives.

---

**User Response: Text**

The Watlington doctors surgery is already at capacity. It takes 3 weeks to get an appointment unless it is an emergency. Any increased development would detract from the area being classed as a village.

I chose housing because this is the reason for the plan.

I chose climate change because I feel this the biggest threat we currently face as a species. Everything we plan has to try to mitigate this. Climate change is happening already and can only get worse. Increased flooding is a real threat.

I chose transport because in planning one of the best ways to reduce our impact on the climate is to reduce car dependency. We need better active travel infrastructure and better public transport so that it is easier for people not to use private cars. Homes need to be near the services people need and to train stations

I appreciate its a reality that we need to build new homes but this should not be at the expense of trees and wildlife habitat. Too many of the proposed sites are on green spaces, woodland and with wildlife. Building in these areas will not meet the strategic matter of addressing climate change and will only serve to further deteriorate the local climate.

Other (Agriculture) - Maintaining and growing our own food is essential as shown by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine - we cannot rely on other countries and we cannot afford to lose our Best most valuable Agricultural land. Environmental sustainability must imply the production of more home-grown food.

Green Belt - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban sites

Community Facilities and Infrastructure- Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over the years and are already under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and congested. Other facilities such as sewage is also under stress.

Loss of agricultural land and the space to grow and produce our own raw materials. Loss of green belt land. Negative impact on the facilities and roads around the developments

---

**User Response: Text**

The borough is a rural area, which must be preserved in spite of the government targets, which may not reflect the needs of the local community or take into consideration the impact on the local area. Given the existing "brain drain" to London from West Kent, I am not convinced that any substantial economic developments would be likely to change that. Although Kent is an expensive place to live, the attraction of higher salaries and London weighting is appealing to many local people.

As stated above, without investment in new transport links, the current overloaded A roads will become even more congested, resulting in poor air quality and increased carbon emissions, as well as impacting on the quality of life for local residents. Any increase in population must be accompanied by additional capital and revenue investment in healthcare.

To protect the borough from the ridiculous housing numbers that central government are trying to impose.

The Local Plan should provide overarching strategic guidance to support the development of the Borough as a whole. Development of housing and with that, affordable housing is a key priority. In considering development options, it is essential to provide solutions that promote sustainable travel opportunities. Locating development close to existing infrastructure provides best solutions that mitigate congestion and helps deliver positive climate change.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

---

**User Response: Text**

Sorry but this is getting silly! How can I possibly prioritise just 3 Options? This will be an inadequate answer, but I'll do my best: -

To protect Natural Environment & prevent Climate Change. Enhance our public transport system and to prevent increased road congestion. To maintain the character & identity of rural settlements. provide affordable homes for local residents and deter the migration to our new builds from London.

If we do not look after our natural environment and seek to support measures to address climate change TMBC is not being responsible. By looking at community facilities and infrastructure with the other two matters you will help to provide local delivery of local needs which is where each community needs to get to.

Other: (agriculture) As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREENBELT - It is vital to protect metropolitan land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF.

- 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

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Obvious need for more housing. If there's to be more housing, transport needs to be improved and Greenbelt must be protected or it will disappear over time.

**AGRICULTURE**

As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, maintaining and growing our own UK production is mor important than ever before. We cannot afford to lose BMV land to development. Environmental sustainability must imply the production of more home-grown food.

**GREEN BELT**

it is vital to protect MGB land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

---

**User Response: Text**

- (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
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

**COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in a bad condition and already congested

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

TMBC is presently unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing. Equally so, TMBC is not able to meet the Housing Delivery Test. Accordingly, there is a pressing need for housing in the borough and the Local Plan will need to consider this as a priority in terms of it being a strategic matter.

OTHER (Agriculture) as evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine 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.

GREEN BELT It is vital to protect metropolitan land at all cost. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF.

- 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.

---

**User Response: Text**

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 urban land

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Most important, housing is not important, we have enough housing. Plus cost of living rise means people cannot afford to get onto the housing market or move anyway. Therefore Extra housing is not needed and we should be protecting what lovely habitat we have.

We have a duty to conserve and protect the natural environment of the predominantly rural borough.

We should focus on providing community facilities and infrastructure which are inadequate for the number of people already in the borough.

This is the only planet we have and we need to look after our Green Belt for future generations.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and always congested at peak times.

---

**User Response: Text**

All the strategies are important but the Housing one is not strategy ....it is the only function of the plan

Retention of the metropolitan green belt, and AONB to retain the attractive character of the region, whilst ensuring that they are 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.

please send info on options .

Because this is a beautiful rural area that we don't want to be spoilt by unnecessary building

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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



---

**User Response: Text**

regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

We should protect the environment as much as possible and ensure that developments are placed where roads/cycle lanes and public transport options exist.

The natural environment needs to be preserved as we need to address climate change. Transport is vital if we wish to reduce congestion on the roads particularly with an additional 16k houses in the Borough. To preserve the rural integrity of the Borough

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

All are important But Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

Any housing that is built will place more pressure on already over-pressured infrastructure and facilities. I also feel that the climate should be foremost in any decision. Although we need housing to help with near/mid term needs, once the climate tips beyond a certain point then we will all be impacted so everything should be done with this longer-term reality in mind.

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate change is the No 1 threat to our existence, above wars, pestilence and natural disasters, it has been for many years and we are all at risk, maybe not in our lifetime, but certainly the next generations. Develop with this in mind.

Population growth is also an element beyond our control, housing is an absolute essential.

Economic development is an essential that will naturally embrace retail, transport, community facilities

Preserving character of rural/semi rural but climate change considerations must influence every decision

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Green belt and climate change are priorities above housing needs. Building houses will inevitably adversely impact our carbon footprint unless it is committed in law to be carbon zero (not offset). I don't see how building so many new houses in green belt or elsewhere can be justified. Better to repurpose existing buildings using existing materials.

Plan will not work if transport and infrastructure are strategic priorities. This was a major failing of the 2018 plan.

Reasons as given in Question 10

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

We must protect the green belt, no reason is good enough to develop it.

Climate change is the single most important issue for the future and protecting the green belt is complimentary to this.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

See above.

Climate change should be the number one priority as this will have a major impact on all other areas, in particular any developments on land at risk of flooding. The Green Belt should be fully protected as once it has been destroyed it cannot be recovered. There are not enough community facilities/infrastructure for the existing population needs so these should also be prioritised.

there would be too much traffic in this area, as it is the Hadlow road is a nightmare around school hours.

There is overlap between some of these strategic matters, i.e. Natural environment, green belt and climate change, all of which are important, but only one is ticked to allow the other two important matters to be included.

It is important that the local character and communities are reflected in new buildings as well as ensuring that existing services and public facilities are robust enough to serve the new development.

**Community Facilities**

Current lack of doctor and dentist facilities. Road structure into Tonbridge is often overwhelmed

**Green Belt**

Vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt to check urban sprawl.

prevent neighbouring towns and villages merging

protecting the countryside

preserve the character of historic towns

Tonbridge

---

**User Response: Text**

There are significant opportunities to change the use of sites and development of existing building areas within the High Street which is dying due to the change in retail habits.

I am in favour of urban development and there are still brown field sites in Tonbridge. Many people moved to Hildenborough for its rural character whereas people in towns moved for what urban settlements can offer. With the influx of more people to the borough the green belt becomes even more important both for recreation and mental well-being. Air quality is important so green spaces become the lungs of the borough

Need to preserve special quality of rural villages, rather than damage by a dash for growth.

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to *guide* your demand for housing

Proposed development of new housing in the Borough should be mindful of and relevant to the existing community facilities and infrastructure. There should be no developments that put excess pressure and demand on local communities and facilities that do not have the slack to cope with additional demand upon them.

Impact on the natural environment must be minimised. The World is facing a huge crisis caused by a lack of awareness about our impact on the natural world. TMBC must not allow destruction of the countryside in which we live and work.

Current Infrastructure insufficient- climate change is creating more flooding for an area already high risk and the integrity of the green belt must be maintained. There are many alternative "brown field sites" available across the borough. Developers are only interested in profit not communities.

Agriculture - As evidenced by shortages caused by the Ukrainian war we must maintain a robust domestic arable agriculture.

Green Belt-It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green belt land

- a. to check the unrestricted sprawl of 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
- e. to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging recycling of derelict and urban land.

---

**User Response: Text**

Community facilities / infrastructure - Facilities in health and education have already badly deteriorated over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under

Why does TMBC continually wish to develop KH? Broadwater Farm should not be developed. Did we not learn anything during the pandemic when there were various shortages, Broadwater should continue to be used as an orchard, its very important for the local environment to supply food for the South Eastern Counties

The area in North Tonbridge does not have the infrastructure for medical, education and road network to accommodate additional people

It is essential that we protect the Green Belt around us and the natural habitat of animals and birds.

---

**User Response: Text**

The traffic is bad in this area. The local area is trying to reduce pollution and speeding by maintaining a 20mph speed limit.

The aim must be to maintain and enhance what we already have rather than using more natural resources. Facilities and infrastructure must be able to cope with existing levels before we force it to breakdown.

Tough to choose. Tonbridge is the main town and needs to remain functional for the benefit of all tmbc citizens. Putting all development there to have an easy life by avoiding green belt land will ultimately affect everyone. Facilities always seem to be overlooked. Yet developing some of the smaller villages and town would provide the scale in local areas to provide such services effectively thereby taking away traffic. When kids need to go to school latest. Climate change is Important as seen this summer.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

explanation already given above.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large

---

**User Response: Text**

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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (agricultural) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukrain, 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. Enviromental sustainability must imply the production of more home- grown food.

GREEN BELT- It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF;

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

I believe environmental, climate and preservation of the green belt should govern how the plan is constructed.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.



---

### User Response: Text

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

There is constant pressure on the Green Belt which must be protected. We need green spaces to be the lungs of our community, green corridors either side of the main access routes are essential to encourage and protect wild life and maintain bio diversity.

To preserve the rural integrity of the borough

The natural environment and Green Belt are crucial for:

- Environmental sustainability
- Biodiversity
- Tackling Climate Change & Carbon Capture
- Human well being
- Farming and food security
- Tourism

---

**User Response: Text**

It is crucial we are able to grow and develop the economy to ensure the prosperity of the community.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconstruction of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to

place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

Green belt and the natural environment must be protected, even the smaller sites there could be a large impact on nature and biodiversity.

Transport, Community facilities and infrastructure are key to supporting any development which should be sympathetic with the green belt.

Cannot afford to lose best agricultural land

Vital to protect green belt and avoid continuous urban sprawl

Local facilities and infrastructure are already overstretched - education, congestion on poor quality roads and

---

**User Response: Text**

health services

Transport:

Community facilities & infrastructure

Economic Development

Transport, Community facilities and infrastructure are key to supporting any development which should be sympathetic with the green belt.

The required infrastructure needs to be in place before any additional housing is built, including community facilities and infrastructure and transport, and failure to consider climate change will result in an unsustainable solution.

Quality of life for residents. Preservation of the planet, failure to consider climate change seriously will result in an unsustainable solution.

The required infrastructure needs to be in place before any additional housing is built.

Focus on greenbelt ensures continuity of use of productive farmland at a time when national food inflation is driven by the scale of imported goods while TMBC's analysis also overlooks the significant contribution that several of these particular sites bring to the local communities, through providing easy access to the beautiful Kentish landscape for exercise and building mental health, at a time when our nation is suffering from a major health crisis both in obesity and mental health and care.

TMBC needs to minimise greenfield development and look instead elsewhere to other sites already well supported with adequate infrastructure where residents are not significantly dependent on their cars to meet their daily needs.

Environmental sustainability.

Sufficient facilities for the community as it currently exists.

Enough quality Green space for the communities needs.

The reasons are those highlighted in Question 4 above.

---

### User Response: Text

For all the reasons already stated in this consultation response:

- protection of green belt
- to protect already stretched health and education services, and underinvested, over congested / busy existing road and transport in / through north-east Tonbridge / Higham / Hadlow.

housing needs to be shared throughout our borough to prevent over crowded areas, the increase of urban areas within our borough and to prevent the rise of poverty. housing needs to be shared and spreaded as option 4 shows the best option for all of the borough as a whole, each area gets increased but keeps its beauty. it also enable us to use our resources to a better standard such as housing and support, parking which is already a serious issue due to the increase of people, it being the only form of transport, due to a lack of public transport (we have no trains or busses in Burham and Wouldham). The medical practice is full to the brim and 2 doctors for 2000 patience is not acceptable. the schools and adding 16000 houses to one area, education and resources would struggle and therefore poverty would increase. Community would be lost, so would natural beauty and historic spaces due to the area going from rural to urban. the roads and the traffic would become a serious issue and would result in higher pollution.

from a housing point of view we do need more houses in TMBC as the housing list is around 5 years long, the share of housing across the borough, would insure the spread of class and people, it would also mean people could stay closer to their families than having to move to the other side of TMBC because they decided to put 16000 houses in one area.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT - Our roads are in bad condition and often congested. Roads are physically constrained by existing buildings and infrastructure, and it struggles to cope with current demand - there is limited option to expand routes. Public transport is poor and overpriced (eg school buses). We need to ensure a modal shift in our transport system creating better opportunities for active transport, facilitating local infrastructure and community and at the same time improving health. New development will require modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. it has proved impossible to bring forward improvements to south Tonbridge and in face the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road was made the situation worse.

CLIMATE CHANGE - this is the biggest challenge facing us, and has implications for local development in terms of how we deliver net zero, as well as adaptation to flood, weather extremes etc which will put further pressure on local infrastructure. We need to build new affordable housing - but in a way which ensures that these are built to the highest environmental standards across the borough, and maximise opportunities for renewable

---

**User Response: Text**

energy, for reductions in energy demand, and which promotes active and public transport rather than adding to congestion on our roads. this has implications across all the other sectors - how we build our communit infrastructure, our housing etc.

where development has taken place it has allowed new building in areas of high background radiation levels

climate change

pressing need to unleash economic development to support our towns and community.

We cannot keep concreting over fields: as we have seen, when it rains heavily the water overwhelms the storm drains resulting in discharge of raw sewage into the sea. This water also does not soak through the ground into the aquifers on which we rely for our water supply. More houses means increased demand for water; more houses on fields reduces supply.

Economic Development and Housing have an unavoidable impact on the environment, but we must minimise that.

We are facing climate catastrophe. Any new houses built must be powered by renewable energy and have a minimal carbon impact. Similarly, there are too many cars in the borough (try walking along Tonbridge high street on a Saturday morning). The plan must encourage use of active travel and public transport and disincentivise car use. However, it must also consider the problem that can be seen around Knights Park in Tunbridge Wells - limited space for cars in the housing development (and presumably poor and/or expensive bus links) lead to residents parking their cars up on the side of the road up to the cinema.

I am really really concerned about the housing number TMBC are being asked to provide within the life time of the Local Plan. TMBC are being asked to deliver a 30% increase to current housing stock , over this period the Office for National Statistics is projecting a population increase of 5.7%. The massive scale of development can only be achieved through incorporating large scale developments which we know are marketed at people moving into the borough from higher cost housing area in and around London. This can only be to the detriment of current TMBC residents.

All are important, but housing is not strategic, it is the reason for the plan in the first place. Additionally, infrastructure is never considered in these plans and building is allowed to proceed without any thought for the requirement for additional services e.g. doctors, schools, public transport and the impact on existing roads that cannot be supplemented or improved.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, maintaining and

---

**User Response: Text**

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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Protecting our environment over building is not environmentally sustainable.

Those factors are important to me for enjoying living in the village.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

The protection of green belt and AONB should be a priory.

Consideration should be given to climate change, in respect of weather patterns causing flooding and drought conditions.

Sustainability of providing and retaining of water to/from all new developments must be a priory, given the issues

---

**User Response: Text**

that Southworn Water have had in recent months. This consideration must be given to all utilities providing essential services.

The road transport infrastructure is inadequate, particularly at peak times. The pressure during these times causes huge stress for individuals trying to get to schools/work/etc. The road infrastructure is failing for current housing and further development would increase the problem.

Do not lose most valuable High Grade Agricultural land to development. We need as a country to not destroy such land to get better self-sufficiency for food production and sustained production for the future with all the uncertainties of the world. The Green belt was put there for a purpose, to stop the sprawling of development towards or into one another. Infrastructure cannot cope, it is stretched, if not pretty much at capacity as it is, schools, doctors, dentists, shops, road and transport generally. Tonbridge is a historic character market town, it must retain this status and not become a suburb with sprawling developments and we must safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

Green Belt must be protected to avoid sprawl and to protect the special historic characteristics of our towns.

Agricultural land must be protected for food production.

Community facilities and infrastructure are already over-stretched, the roads are congested and in a poor state of repair.

To maintain the rich heritage of historic buildings within the area.

To maintain the rural landscape.

To avoid expansion of the existing road network.

See comment above. I don't think its possible to choose 3 only.

Green Belt:

The Green Belt is irreplaceable, and to even consider building upon it sets a dangerous precedent from which it will be impossible to return. Its shape is fundamental to its purpose, acting literally as a 'belt' to contain urban development, which is why I do not believe its boundaries should be altered, eg. sacrificing one area of Green Belt in order to extend another.

Natural environment:

I'm not sure that a truly 'natural environment' exists anywhere in the South East any more – there is not a scrap of land that hasn't been shaped by development in some way – but I believe it is fundamental to any local plan to factor in ways to reverse this by including areas of land for rewilding, and for encouraging and supporting biodiversity of plant and animal species. Wildlife needs to be taken into consideration from the outset, not as an afterthought, and 'green' corridors maintained to allow wildlife to move safely between areas.

---

### User Response: Text

#### Built and historic environment:

I feel that it is important to maintain the differences between town life and village life that have always existed historically, and to remember that not everybody wants to live somewhere that has purpose-built retail and community facilities. Plenty of those already exist within the larger villages and towns of the borough. For some people, access to wildlife, open spaces, solitude, peace and quiet and dark skies will always be far more important than immediate access to 'facilities'. Many of the smaller villages within the borough are unique in character, with houses and other buildings which reflect their history. Crossing the borough, we are lucky to have several long-distance trails which date back centuries and again inform us of the history of the area, and on a local level a network of footpaths, bridleways and byways which again are an important part of the history of each individual area. These routes need to be taken into consideration within development plans.

#### Climate change:

The last few years have proved that climate change is no longer a thing of the future. It is happening now. What steps are TMBC planning to take to ensure that any larger scale development within the borough is self-sustaining in terms of energy consumption (solar panels), and efficient in terms of water use (re-use of grey water, rain-water harvesting)?

#### Quality of life for residents

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

They should be the most important.



---

**User Response: Text**

Focusing on housing only will destroy the north eastern section of Tonbridge and Malling.

The area needs to significantly improve in a number of socioeconomic areas before you can simply place 1000s of people in those areas.

Vast amounts of housing without better roads, more health and education facilities, leisure and retail units and cultural and employment opportunities will be a disaster for the areas of Snodland and The Medway gap.

A sprawling eyesore of urban suburbia without the above will make this part of Kent a no-go zone for anyone with taste, a brain and a love of the countryside.

you cannot condemn this area to boring, suburban obscurity.. it will become an extension of The Medway towns and the many social and economic issues they face.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Climate, green belt, natural environment and the built environment are closely interlinked and need to be considered holistically. Housing should be considered a priority only in the context of above and likewise in relation to community facilities, infrastructure and transport. Infact none of these strategic matters can be considered in isolation.

The garden of England is being destroyed to house people migrating from London. Not for local people to live in and to enjoy their countryside.

Housing - due to the chronic under-delivery and the acute shortage that is now prevalent within the Borough.

---

### User Response: Text

Climate Change - this is a global issue which is at the forefront of international politics. Emerging Local Plans must introduce climate change positive policies to contribute locally to the wider issue.

Green Belt - there are certain parts of the Green Belt which do not contribute to its function or purpose as Green Belt in as far as the 5 purposes as listed in the NPPF. A particular area of note is land to the north of Norman Road to the west of the High Street. 71% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt. This is a significant constraint to development and in the Council meeting its housing need. A review of the poorer performing parts of the Green Belt is required and released so that development may come forward.

To protect our countryside

Community facilities and infrastructure.

The existing health and education facilities are already stretched. The roads are very often congested.

Green Belt

We must protect the existing Green Belt for the following reasons:

- 1) to stop the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas,
- 2) to stop the merging of neighbouring towns,
- 3) to stop the encroachment of towns into the countryside,
- 4) to preserve the setting and character of historic towns,
- 5) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict urban land.

Other

We cannot afford to lose Best, Most Valuable agricultural land. Sustainability must imply the growing of our own food.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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

---

**User Response: Text**

assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

See answer to Q9

Green belt and aonb should be protected and ring fenced against any development

Once you're ruined an area you can't un-ruin it.

I don't see how there is going to be sufficient water for all the proposed dwellings when the Water suppliers failed to meet the demand this summer (2022)

Looking after our , green belt (natural environment) and climate change all have an impact on our planet, and as a community we need to protect these as much as possible for our future generations. Existing communities need the services and infrastructure maintaining and improving as they have been eroded over the last 10/20 years.

Preservation of Green Belt is key. It has been designated for a specific reason.

Transport especially roads is a key problem. Any attempt to add more houses to existing urban areas simply increases the length of the traffic jam to where the facilities are located. e.g. doctors moving to the centre of town.

Built and historic selected to protect the quality and character of the environment

Infrastructure needs to be secured and commitment secured through the independent agencies to have confidence in delivery.

Natural environment facing immense pressure and requires protection.

Climate change is a factor and means we need more available water - and more facilities for water waste. We need more reservoir capacity.

Community facilities and infrastructure: congestion on the roads, lack of primary and secondary school places, health services under-resourced.

Green belt: at the same time we need to ensure a swathe of green belt for leisure, wildlife, recreation.

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Any residential development should incorporate facilities and infrastructure sufficient for the proposed increase in population. Green belt is a very valuable asset and wherever possible should be protected. Many people prefer to live in or very nearby an urban area and all brown fields should be exploited wherever possible.

If we do not address the climate change we will all be doomed. We need a very affordable public transport service to try and encourage the public to use it and leave their cars at home.

Before a new development the infrastructure should be built. The combined effort in infrastructure planning is important in **identifying deficits and needs of all communities involved**. It helps ensure that the right infrastructure is delivered efficiently and to the benefit of the said communities.

I fully agree with Matt Boughton's comments re infrastructure needs being very important

CLIMATE CHANGE - The Local Plan should facilitate the transition to a low carbon future for the Borough in every aspect, given this is the single most pressing issue in our era.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have deteriorated and are under stress. Walking and cycling are not supported by adequate infrastructure and incentives, including cycling to school. The roads are often congested partly due to private transport to our secondary schools from many homes in cycling distance.

OTHER (AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, maintaining and growing our own UK production is more important than ever before. We cannot afford to lose high-quality agricultural land to housing development. Environmental sustainability must imply the production of more home-grown food.

climate change sits at the heart of this - related to this therefore is greenbelt

---

**User Response: Text**

transport will help climate change

the other aspects are important - I recognise we do need housing, economic development etc. and already tonbridge is a thriving place - with a lively high street (challenged yes but still amazingly resilient compared to many high streets) but all that said climate change is absolutely the most pressing thing.

energy as mentioned above - TMBC needs a policy on that.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in

Ukraine, 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.

---

**User Response: Text**

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The

MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Need to preserve and protect rural areas and the green belt

Infrastructure & Community facilities: Meeting housing needs is vital for all but existing communities and their infrastructure requirement must not suffer when new developments are incorporated.

Nature Environment: We ignore at our peril.

Housing: We recognise housing needs

I absolutely believe that the country can become self sufficient in food production thus reversing reliance on imported food stuffs. This cannot be achieved by the continued destruction of existing farming land.

I want TMBC to lead the way in delivering a sustainable solution. Our wildlife is heading for mass extinction. Just look at the song birds as one example. Their demise must be reversed. This will only be achieved by maintaining green belt, AoB and improving the habitates of species. In so doing we build a better world for our children.

I support new housing as assessed, but it needs to be provided on Brown Field sites, We should stop eating away at our countryside

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate change is our greatest danger and any development should take this and for example danger of flooding into account

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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.

---

**User Response: Text**

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Preserving rural integrity of the borough

Climate change is the overriding priority of our time. I feel that the Green Belt and local infrastructure / facilities are under most threat from the government's determination to further expand development in the South East.

I am interested in enhancing the natural environment of Kent and retaining it's special association with being the garden of England

Green Belt - It is vital to protect MGB land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- a) to check 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 & special character of historic towns
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

OTHER - Agricultural - As evidenced by the war in Ukraine, maintaining and growing our own UK production is more important than ever before. We cannot afford to lose this Best, Most Valuable agricultural land. Environmental sustainability must imply the production of more home grown food.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Too many country roads would have to be expanded to cope with the increased traffic, this would also apply to schools, doctors surgeries, churches and shopping facilities.

We cannot afford to lose Green Belt land and need to imply production of home grown food for environmental sustainability.

Green Belt land is vital to Tonbridge:

to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas



---

**User Response: Text**

to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

to assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

to assist in urban regeneration - encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Community facilities and infrastructure are already overstretched and our roads are often congested and in need of repair

I believe we already live in a fairly well developed area and our green belt / farm land is vital to the sustainability of our food production and climate. These areas must be protected and brownfield sites used instead. If we are then full, we are full and alternate areas outside of the borough, probably outside of the county need to take more of the burden. Once developed such areas never go back to what they were.

If you take the view that there is no real need for all this huge volume of building and that what we need can be satisfied by a radical re-use of brown field sites and vacant retail space then it follows that the three strategic matters to prioritise are those that protect what we have before it all gets irreversibly concreted over.

**Agriculture-** food shortages= need to grow our own. Environmental Sustainability MUST include the production of home- grown food.

**Green Belt-** It is vital to protect MGB at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the MPPF

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built- up areas
2. To prevent neighbouring towns merging onto one another
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
4. To prevent the setting and special setting of historic towns
5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

**Community facilities and infrastructure** - Facilities in Health and Education have deteriorated in recent years

---

### User Response: Text

and are under massive stress. There have been difficulties accessing health and medical services in Tonbridge, and with increasing population, the facilities would not be fit for purpose.

Many of the roads are in bad condition and there is a perpetual problem with significant traffic congestion in and around the town.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE)- As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

Green Belt- It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF;

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE- Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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

---

**User Response: Text**

(e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

It is important to preserve the environment that people in the borough have now, and wish to retain - rural areas, Public Rights of Way, agricultural land.

Transport needs improving for the rate payers now, not just as a reaction to more development

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: Community facilities and infrastructure Economic development Green Belt Housing Natural environment Retail Tonbridge (as the borough's principal town centre) Transport Other – please state below (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.

---

**User Response: Text**

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

I consider the Green belt and ANOB to be areas of existing legislation.

I consider climate change to be an important issue, not to be ignored.

Local walks, nature and the historic beauty of the Kentish countryside MUST be protected.

I am a tour guide who specialises in local tours for foreign visitors. No foreign visitor wants to come and see housing estates where rolling fields and tree covered hills once were.

Important to maintain the integrity and function of the Green Belt ,and Agricultural land ( this will be needed a lot more in the future for food or assisting in use of renewable energies) . Adequate infrastructure .....especially roads .....is essential to accommodate . Economic development is needed to provide local employment . This includes agricultural work as well as maintaining green belt land.

Predominantly a rural borough so this should be the priority for the local plan - to maintain and enhance this aspect of the area whilst ensuring transport is improved to enable transport within Tonbridge and Malling

Agriculture - We cannot afford to lose Best, Most Valuable agricultural land to development. Environmental sustainability must imply the production of more home-grown food.

Green Belt - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

We should not be building on Best, Most, Valuable agricultural land. If we do we are reducing our capability to grow more of our own food in this country.

It is essential that the Green Belt around Tonbridge is maintained. It conforms to NPPF requirements.

Health and Education facilities are already struggling. It is unlikely that the sewage system would be able to cope with a possible 2000 extra homes. The roads are already heavily congested at peak times, without adding even more traffic.

n/a

---

**User Response: Text**

These are breaking point now

no response

Agriculture - War in Ukraine demonstrates more than ever our need to produce or own food/crops

Green Belt - Vital to preserve Greenbelt at all costs. Prevent urban sprawl, stop neighbourhoods merging, safeguarding countryside, assist in urban regeneration

Community Facilities - prevent further deterioration of health and education facilities and transport infrastructure

Green Belt -It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs.The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF.

To preserve the settins and character of historic towns.

Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress.Roads are congested and in a bad state.

Because they are the most important to me as a resident.

With current developments being built and proposed new developments, Kings Hill, West Malling, East Malling etc are on target to become a high density housing estate in a suburb of Greater Maidstone. Green Belt MUST be used to protect local communities from coalescing in to one huge conurbation.

Housing: there are many young people who are moving away to other areas of the country who are in need of affordable housing locally who in turn could be employed in supporting services and economic development here.

Community facilities and infrastructure: without upgraded/updated infrastructure communities will not be able to function economically and will move away to other areas.

This is the wrong premise and an inappropriate question, see above.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

---

**User Response: Text**

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Well, all of these are important. I can only vote for the ones that matter most to me. I haven't a clue what Tonbridge as the borough's principal town centre means as a strategic objective as opposed to a statement of fact. I have selected natural environment as this really covers the preservation of the green belt which I firmly believe in.

Keeping of Green Belt and natural environment is essential as you are slowly taking these things away from us and our wildlife. Concentrate on retaining these and climate change will automatically be helped too. Transport facilities are not good enough. Not green enough using old stock and expensive bus fare plus no bus service from Larkfield to West Malling Train Station

Priorities **must be** and in this order:

2 GREEN BELT

1 CLIMATE CHANGE

3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Housing is **not** a strategic matter. It cannot feature amongst the more pressing and urgent issues of protecting our natural environment.

Surely they are all a priority

These strategic matters should be a priority in the areas shown on the site plans above in order to protect and preserve the existing environment and settlements and their way of life. These are areas of outstanding natural beauty and also envelope conservation areas.

To preserve the integrity of the borough

---

**User Response: Text**

As previously stated, the green spaces are integral to Kings Hill. Its connection with the natural environment is core to its identity and appeal. The local infrastructure is already woefully insufficient, and would literally crumble under these new plans. Antisocial behaviour would increase. Local economy would suffer as wealthy residents would leave the area. Mental health will suffer - rates of depression will rise.

Greenbelt land and undeveloped land including fields, agricultural land, woodlands/ancient woodlands, between communities is a key ingredient in creating the attractive and unique character of the towns and villages in the borough and must be retained and protected as much as possible. Once this land is built on, it is lost forever.

The world is warming fast - the environment must be the primary consideration. The preservation of green belt and undeveloped land is of primary importance.

Greenbelt need to protect agricultural land and rural landscape as far as possible. We need houses but not this quantity – however we are were we are – houses need to be near transport routes especially by 2040 and affordable. This does not mean pack them in and tiny . Flooding is a big constraining issue in the TMBC area. Tonbridge is vulnerable as are many sites. Climate change will affect this area with excess water in winter and dry summers. Storage of said winters would be good to put into action.

Greenbelt and especially AONB is of paramount importance to retain the natural environment, wildlife, mental health of residents and should be identified for development. AONB is a no go zone.

Houses being build should be built with features that promote environmentally friendly features such as solar panel, grey water storage, air heat source pumps, sockets for electric cars

Houses should respect the natural landscape with lots of planting of native species

Houses should be disability friendly

Whilst it is recognised that some development is required any development should make use of brown field sites where ever possible and not use green belt or sites on outstanding natural beauty or sites of historic and environmental value.

Preservation of rural integrity of the borough

No response

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate change affects us all and should be a fundamental factor in decision making. Green Belt and the natural environment are two factors which help to make this Borough the place it currently is and should be protected as far as possible. Once changed, they cannot be restored.

CPRE Kent is of the view that the right housing should be provided in the right places – it should be sustainably located. And in terms of sustainability (and the issues of addressing climate change) that road-building is failing to provide the congestion relief and economic boost promised while devastating the environment as set out in research commissioned by CPRE (<https://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/the-end-of-the-road-challenging-the-road-building-consensus/> )

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.

The Council should be aiming for 20% biodiversity. The State of Nature in Kent report (July 2022) <https://kentnature.org.uk/state-of-nature/> (funded by LWT, KCC and KPOG) sets out how we need to recognise that nature is vital for a happy, healthy society. How it reduces pollution and flooding and supports adaptation to climate change – including locking up carbon. How every effort needs to be taken to ensure no further loss or deterioration of key habitats. How bigger landscape-scale projects need to be delivered to join-up fragmented habitats and secure more land in conservation management - in order to help deliver an ambitious Nature Recovery Network, as enshrined in the new Environment Act.

Preserving the innate beauty of the AONB is also critically important – it is well documented that such places provide urban and countryside dwellers an escape to beautiful areas for fresh air and exercise.

It is important to focus development on urban centres with the requisite facilities to minimise the need for transport for the population to use schools, shops and other amenities. Any focus on developing rural areas will inevitably place pressure on roads and increase traffic with the associated pollution as the population has to travel to urban areas to access and enjoy shops, services and amenities that do not exist in the villages and rural areas.

To preserve the rural integrity of the borough

Greenbelt - this needs to be kept as is, if you have these greenbelt/AONB sites then that feeds into the natural environment, climate change and built and historic environment options.

Community facilities and infrastructure - these are creaking already and need to be looked at BEFORE adding more pressure to them.

Transport - public transport links in the villages seem to be being taken away rather than improved, leading to more car use, leading to more road congestion, leading to more air pollution.... fix one and you have fixed many other problems.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, maintaining and



---

**User Response: Text**

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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Because I do not wish to live in a concrete jungle Green belt are the lungs of our country so do not destroy them

Climate change and energy efficiency should be at the heart of the strategy behind the Local Plan because of the severity of the impact if it's not addressed. As TMBC is primarily a rural area, the natural environment should take priority.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Many are important but 'Housing' is not strategic and this is the sole function of the plan. There must be other ways of making money apart from using precious, irreplaceable land.

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

I live here because of the local areas I can walk into natural beauty of the local woods and landscape, the wildlife which has gradually come back would be lost.

nobody in these new houses will have anywhere to go as you are suggesting to build everywhere there is any open space.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt Land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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 prevent 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.

---

**User Response: Text**

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

No comment

I have no opinion on Tonbridge as the borough's principle town centre, as Maidstone is much more accessible to get to from my area, and as such, I rarely go there. That said, whilst I understand the need for housing, that housing also needs transport links and facilities, and should not be crammed into the green-spaces of pre-existing estates. The need to preserve the environment should also be considered, as should the development of infrastructure and community facilities.

our area is made up of compact, greenbelt hamlets and small village, historical importance already overbuilt in villagw

- climate change has the ability to undo any development if poor decision making is taken. e.g. building on flood plains.

- once the natural environment makes way for development it's extremely difficult to reverse

- green belt is one of a few classic restrictions that should stay in place

The chosen issues are existential whereas the others are merely important.

Community Facilities

Current lack of doctor and dentist facilities. Road infrastructure into Tonbridge often overwhelmed.

---

## User Response: Text

### Green Belt

Vital to check Metropolitan Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl

Prevent towns and villages merging

Protect the countryside

Preserve the character of historic towns

### Tonbridge

There are a number of opportunities to change the use of sites within Tonbridge Town centre. The recent example of Harlow Councils Town Centre plan shows how dynamic plans can revitalise dying High Streets. You want people to already to be in the town centre minimising the need for additional car parks and blocking roads trying to get in.

Put simply, the area of Tonbridge & Malling is an attractive area of the country to live in that needs to stay that way; therefore prioritising the built and natural environments should be prioritised, along with the wider need for reducing Climate Change which is critically important to giving our children a future.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As mentioned in my response to Q9, 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.

---

**User Response: Text**

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Preserving the green belt and farm land has to be one of the key priorities to protect our food security, climate security and the natural environment.

New developments should be met with an increase in community facilities and infrastructure, so that local services such as doctors and schools are not over stressed.

The green belt should be protected as much as possible, however developments on the green belt should be judged on a case by case basis.

All new developments should be required to have better environmental performance than currently required by building regulations. The opportunity should be taken to start improving the environmental performance of the local housing stock.

Maintaining the natural environment is essential for biodiversity which the planet needs to survive. We think this also includes consideration of climate change.

The reasons are we have all seen how large urban developments impact on local communities ie Kings Hill and we have all heard the phrase “lessons have been learnt “ but the same mistakes are made ,new developments are not supported enough

no comment

Protecting the integrity of the green belt and the environment should be fundamentals.

Climate Change - the multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate eg by preserving carbon capturing green spaces

---

**User Response: Text**

Green Belt - preservation supports the point above and also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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

Transport - Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new development across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an on going basis. Time limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

Already explained in previous answers

These areas need protecting at all costs

there are plenty of brownfield and greenfield sites that can avoid these areas being damaged

Climate change is the number 1 priority because if we don't do something about it we won't have a planet fit to live on . Green belt and the natural environment are part of making life worth living and managed correctly can be part of the answer to reducing environmental damage.

We need to grow the economy and as such focus on developing our key urban areas as these have the right commuter links, health services, leisure and retail facilities. Any new housing therefore should be urban or semi urban.

---

**User Response: Text**

Built & Historic environments make Tonbridge & Malling unique and must be maintained - our quiet lanes, orchard landscapes, historic walking routes.

The natural environment of Tonbridge & Malling makes Kent unique - the garden of England - and must be preserved for our future generations.

All three of my choices are based on maintaining a decent quality of life for current and future residents. If housing were prioritised over community health/education facilities, for example, then people's health, wellbeing and future prospects would suffer.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by global warming and added to by the war in Ukraine, maintaining and growing our own UK production is more important than ever before. We cannot afford to lose any Best Most Valuable agricultural land, or indeed any productive agricultural land, to development. Environmental sustainability must imply the production of more home-grown food.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF.

- 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,
- to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in a bad condition and are often congested.

As evidence by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine maintaining and growing our own UK production is more important than ever before.

It is vital to protect metropolitan green belt land at all costs

Community facilities and infrastructure - facilities in health and education are already stretched to breaking point as are our roads which are in poor condition and frequently congested. Further development will only exacerbate this.

Climate change is an emergency anywhere. As for the other two, if we focus on economic development, this would create funds for building affordable housing, and if we focus on community facilities and infrastructure, the borough would attract more young people.

Adequate infrastructure is needed, as is economic development to provide jobs.

---

**User Response: Text**

The greenbelt is important for wildlife and the environment.

I would have also chosen transport, as there is a limited bus route in Hadlow.

The Built and Historic environment provides a "sense of place", a tourist trade and local recreation. The natural environment is essential to a "sense of well-being", relaxation, recreation, exercise. The Greenbelt supports these senses within a context of strategic agriculture, biodiversity, Greenbelt "openness" and objective "permanence" for future generations. Housing must be supported by adequate community facility (e.g medical) and infrastructure (e.g clean transport, energy, water). These are economically provided in the urban areas. Government sources have stated that "unmet housing is unlikely to outweigh harm to the greenbelt"... "housing need does not justify harm done to the greenbelt by inappropriate development"... "protecting our precious greenbelt must be paramount" etc. Local Design Statements can highlight the importance of the above matters and assist in the control of suitable development appropriate for location and need. The above matters work towards limiting Climate Change particularly by limiting unnecessary travel in rural areas and confining travel to major more established routes. The chosen matters are already fixed restraints within which Climate Change, Economic Development, Housing must be confined.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

The quality of the borough as a place to live must be the most important consideration. Once damaged this cannot be easily recovered. The South East is a vibrant economic area and specific provision in the borough is of less direct relevance.

We need a good balance between local facilities, a high quality built environment and the natural environment (the Green Belt is only a mechanism for delivering this - not a strategic matter of itself)

We are losing too much green belt to housing and there is not enough infra structure such as water, electric and doctors dentists etc

Climate Change- To save the planet Green Belt- Preserving its openness is critically important AONB- Preserving the innate beauty of these areas is critically important. They must be preserved such that urban and country dwellers can escape to beautiful areas for fresh air and exercise



---

**User Response: Text**

specifically, community facilities and infrastructure need to be carefully planned against any new developments.

Climate change is the biggest challenge society faces. All that we do adds to green house gases and the natural environment can help mitigate this so any loss of green space will have a negative effect on climate. Getting more cars off the road by having affordable alternatives in public transport and cycle paths has to be a priority.

Green Belt is to be protected

Transport and Education and Medical facilities need material improvement

To preserve the integrity of the borough

To preserve the integrity of the borough

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

They are consistent with my concerns expressed elsewhere in this questionnaire

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge

---

**User Response: Text**

fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

As evidence by the shortages caused by war in Ukraine, 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.

Green belt - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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

Community facilities and infrastructure- Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

To preserve the rural integrity of the borough especially to protect the greenbelt.

These are the most important considerations if we want a worthwhile future on the planet.

---

**User Response: Text**

Preserving the open countryside nature of the local area is critical

Climate change first and foremost as it is an emergency right now.

Green Belt - to preserve our natural environment for the future - it cannot be undone.

Community facilities and infrastructure - most important for our day to day lived experience.

We have chosen these particular strategic matters to reflect & maintain the quality of life in Wateringbury/Tonbridge & Malling/Kent both current & for future generations.

**Tonbridge town centre is in decline** - it has become less attractive as a destination, being full of poor quality shopping, charity shops. Tonbridge needs dense housing so many local people can visit their town shops & ensure these shops viability/survival/growth. Tonbridge has great local transport links to support a local population increase.

**Green Belt** was designated for key reasons around London & SE England & should not be built over for the reasons that it was created in the first place. Housing & employment should be considered nationally - government have set up a Department for Levelling up & communities etc - mass development & encouraging migration to the south East/Tonbridge & Malling flies in the face of these costed policies.

**+ local pollution factors.**

Pollution factors should be considered in the sustainability equation offsetting carbon emissions from carbon intensive building materials, particularly travel/transport for increased number of extra inhabitants as well as leaving green environment alone i.e carbon consumption of growing trees in the ground or tree/green increases.

Agriculture due to shortages

green belt \_ need to protect current green belt areas

community facilities - not enough currently ie no n h s dentist and long waiting for doctors

**OTHER (AGRICULTURE)** - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

**GREEN BELT** - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

---

### User Response: Text

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl and is characterised by openness and permanence.

ANOBs are designated for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the landscape, which when lost can never be recovered.

To preserve the rural integrity of the borough especially to protect the green belt

BUILT AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT - Tonbridge has well documented history with its Castle and reputation as a market town. The town should continue to be well presented and attractive to tourists. An excessive increase in population, and the associated congestion and pollution, will continue to change the town's character and to date this has not been done in a sympathetic way. Many people are aware of the town's congestion and avoid it.

GREENBELT - Preservation supports the point above but it is also important for the well-being of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF, namely...

- 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
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes, if any. Any new development at all will require significant modifications to junctions in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has been impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 'fifteen minute communities' to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. Time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have recently seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill.

---

**User Response: Text**

Resources are already strained in the Borough, further development is, in my opinion, and evidenced by recent permissions, are highly likely to further increase the infrastructural issues. The heavy use of the lanes should be reduced not increased, many of the sites will add to this. Changing the nature/character of the area will be detrimental to current residents and prospective new residents. Agricultural land and rural communities should be protected not abused.

**CLIMATE CHANGE** - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces. **GREENBELT** - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. **TRANSPORT** – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconstruction of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

**GREENBELT** - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

**CLIMATE CHANGE** - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rainwater for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

**BUILT AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

Tonbridge and can be distinguished from other neighbouring towns such as Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells because of its very close proximity to beautiful farmland and countryside. From the town centre open countryside

---

**User Response: Text**

can be reached in a very short walk from Brook Street or Tonbridge School for example. It is a medieval market town with its rural villages and their historic links to the hop industry and fruit growing dating back to the 19th century. Development of the greenfield sites surrounding the town and villages will destroy this unique and very important characteristic of the town and the reason many residents chose to move here rather than Sevenoaks or Tunbridge Wells.

The over-riding concern for us as a family is the environment. During lockdown we realised just how valuable it is to us, in terms of health and wellbeing. We appreciated the drop in pollution from the AQMA road (two of us suffer from asthma, me included) and when we suffer from significant mental health difficulties, and my wife's ongoing treatment post cancer it is the green surrounds that enables us to take exercises and unburden ourselves.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces. GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconstruction of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

We have seen transport services in the area cut and not keeping up with requirements. Transport to Pembury hospital for example.

The roads have not considered development or the infrastructure to keep with planned growth of houses. This has shown strain on existing resources and no party (TMBC, KCC) have looked at this carefully enough.

We are at risk of flooding increasing in the area and there is no clear strategy to help existing housing with flooding risk – and we have seen more housing built on flood plans. There are areas in the Borough – like Borough Green which could easily take up additional housing as this is not linked to flooding.

Tonbridge has the infrastructure needed to sustain the development. Its urban area could be expanded out and high rise buildings introduced which is appropriate for a town centre where accessibility and sustainable travel is

---

**User Response: Text**

particularly good. This would help to lessen the impact on the natural environment and climate which are important as we need to protect these for ourselves and future generations.

Climate change is the most important issue facing humanity at the moment - If this a priority then issues related to transport will also have to be a priority

Natural environments cover green belt and are also related to climate change

Tonbridge should continue to grow as a hub in Kent as it has existing infrastructure, facilities and access. Development should be intensified in Tonbridge to reduce the impact on countryside and natural environments

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Most of our recent housing projects within the borough have had S106 items attached to the planning conditions

---

**User Response: Text**

but the enforcement of these S106 items is unfortunately some what lacking which means things that were meant to happen to facilitate these new builds have not taken place although the houses have been completed.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE)- As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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 urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

The borough contains many areas which should be considered a natural resource which adds to the quality of life of the residents and visitors from the towns and neighbouring areas

From experience and witnessing what is happening to the local environment within the environ of West and East Malling , which is becoming overwhelmed by cumulative development despite the assurances of TMBC / KCC and developers.

Any development should be aware of the area where it is proposed and should be not over developed.

Health and wellbeing has been omitted from the list of 'strategic matters' and the 4 strategic matters ticked above all impact upon the development being planned for and should be the priority issues for consideration.

We need to protect our environment for future generations.

The villages in this area are surrounded by AONBs that support wildlife and farming, and therefore help towards food security. Once green land is gone it can never ben returned.

over population of green belt areas



---

**User Response: Text**

Meeting housing needs of vital for everyone, but existing communities and their infrastructure requirements must not suffer when new developments are incorporated. We ignore the natural environment at our peril.

The Plan should be thinking of the future where we can see retail and many jobs are moving online. There should be more emphasis on how to make individual places more sustainable and with very local transport becoming more sustainable. There will be less need in the future to drive a long way across the Borough e.g. fewer commutes to work outside the borough, fewer shopping trips. More likely to have increased leisure trips locally, e.g. to cafes, community centres. The doctors, dentist etc all need to be within easy reach of households. TMBC also needs to have a better digital/ broadband and mobile phone network. People will have more time to enjoy their local environment e.g. walks and cycle rides locally.

See above

See previous statements

**Other ( Agriculture )**

We cannot lose best , most valuable agricultural land to Development . Environmental sustainability in the present Ukraine conflict means more home grown produce is required to make up the shortages . We should growing more and encouraging agriculture not making it harder .

**Green Belt .**

it is vital to protect the metropolitan green belt land at all costs . Presently it does this around ,Tonbridge by ;

Preventing unrestricted sprawl of large built areas .

It stops neighbouring towns merging with one another .

To safe guard the country side from encroachment .

It preserves the setting and special character of our historic town (enough alone ! )

By assisting with urban regeneration in focusing on recycling derelict and available urban areas in need regeneration .

**Community Facilities and Infrastructure**

Health and Education facilities have deteriorated over the years with austerity measures . To now increase the pressure by greater numbers on the facilities and rely on the vocational calling of its staff is grossly unfair ( cheer

---

**User Response: Text**

for the NHS ! ) .

The congestion presently on the crumbling roads surrounding Tonbridge would also not benefit from additional / increased traffic .

Community Facilities and Infrastructure

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconstruction of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change

---

### User Response: Text

including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The reason I moved to TMBC was for the community feel of it together with landscape and greenbelt land.

Ant development has to be supported first by the infrastructure - transport around the borough is currently poor. It can take 30-60 mins to travel 3/4 miles at peak times. It doesnt take much (roadworks, an accident etc) to cause chaos.

Preserve, protect and respect our local environment. People want to live here because it is an AONB. It is greenbelt land and home to many forms of wildlife and plant life. By failing to prioritise these highlighted strategic matters, you fail to preserve this area for generations to come. As someone who only recently got on to the property ladder in this area, I understand the importance and need for affordable housing, but I want to live here for the natural beauty and village communities too and don't feel the other strategic matters focus on preserving this.

this is what is currently lacking in TMBC. We don't even have an active travel local infrastructure plan.

---

## User Response: Text

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road / London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create '15 minute communities' to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

Housing should not only focus on building new homes, but the prevention of individuals from combining two adjacent homes into one which therefore has the opposite effect of the required increase in housing demand.

Tonbridge town centre is a disgrace and a disappointing place to visit, the retail options are incredibly poor for the main town of our borough.

In my opinion **climate change** should be the main driving factor in all decisions, as it is the greatest threat to sustainability at any level. Water, food production (land use) and energy sources (eg solar) should be important considerations in any planning applications. Grade 1 & 2 agricultural land should not be used for building – you can't eat bricks and concrete. Grade 3 land should be reserved, where possible, for solar energy / water storage / tree planting.

**Community facilities and infrastructure.** Without schools, doctors surgeries/health centres, dentists, decent bus services, cycle lanes, connectivity in all its forms, new development on any scale isn't sustainable.

The **natural environment** is important for biodiversity. Humans and the rest of nature are interlinked. Nature can do without us (and one day it will!) but we can't make it without regard to nature, we're not that smart, although we think we are.

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Sustainable development has not been thoroughly considered, with proposals that will negatively impact local residents and be a detriment to the surround environment.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Would like a borough that can provide affordable housing, good facilities and transport links to connect everything together, whilst protecting country side

Accept there is a need for housing, but desperately need transport and infrastructure to support it , whilst at the same time protecting environment

Climate change will increase the incidence of extreme weather resulting in flooding/drought, extreme heat/cold, higher wind speeds and so on. While the building regulation changes will enable more resilient new buildings, our existing buildings, drains, water supply, roads, bridges, embankments and so on will require improvement to allow them to cope with these changes. This leads to the need for community facilities and infrastructure needing significant investment. With 70% of the Borough being Green Belt, the natural environment will need our help to

---

**User Response: Text**

survive and flourish as these changes take place.

Kings Hill has been expanding quickly in recent years, but facilities and infrastructure lags behind. GP practice is still the same size, no petrol station, no library.

Because I value the area I live in and I would not want to see it change so that it negatively impacts (physically and mentally) people and animals already living there.

See above

Our local community has already suffered under the burden of urban sprawl and enough is enough. I understand the housing targets are provided to TMBC by Government, but who is generating those numbers? The Boomer generation is dying out and the UK has a significantly declining population through Gen X and Z. What with Brexit presumably curbing immigration what's driving this housing demand? Affordability is a false argument. When I bought my first house 35 years ago I couldn't afford to live where I wanted and had to move to where I could afford. What's changed? If the demand is driven by new working practices allowing migration from London then those people do not have affordability issues. If it is social housing then there is some argument, but I have seen no evidence historically that TMBC has done anything about this. All the new build around here has been for profit at the expense of all else.

Whilst all matters are relevant. housing and economic development are a priority for the achievement of sustainable development. This includes providing new homes in a variety of locations where they can meet local needs and supporting existing and new businesses in the district to enable them to grow and support the economic prosperity of the borough/ wider region. In this regard, housing on site 59831 will support the vineyard which delivers significant social, economic and environmental benefits in its own right.

All are important but 8 (Housing) is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to push for more housing, which are not wanted in this area of outstanding natural beauty, AONB.

We ignore the threat and impact of climate change at our peril.

The need to protect the environment is far greater than the need for yet more development in the borough. Once land has been concreted over, it's LOST FOREVER.

There is clearly a need for housing, hence the need for a local plan. If the number of houses is increased, community facilities and infrastructure must be enhanced. There will be a need for schools, health care and

---

**User Response: Text**

recreational facilities. These are no good unless people can reach their homes, places of employment, schools, doctors, dentists or place of recreation. Unless we want to increase the traffic on local roads, consideration must also be given to transport provision. This should preferably be public transport, cycling or walking. Where driving is necessary, there should be provision made for electric car charging.

The Green Belt must be protected at all costs

These are essential to the nature of the borough and the character of the local, individual villages.

- One of our main priorities should be focusing on the natural environment this is often forgotten about as the demand by people seems to always come first.

Agriculture - see answer to question 9.

Green Belt - It is vital to protect MGB land. Giving way to expediency should be avoided at all costs. Damage would be irrevocable and would destroy the nature of local communities.

Community Facilities and Infrastructure - Health and education facilities are under stress. Roads, including main road access into Tonbridge, are congested (extremely so at peak periods).

It is important that despite political pressures in increasing the availability of housing stock around the country, it should not be to the detriment of the environment. As we have seen with the recent pandemic, it highlights the importance of providing green and open spaces to positive mental wellbeing.

Green belt, protection of green/open space and protection of existing smaller settlements (other than towns) from large developments being tacked onto them should be the priorities in my opinion.

This is a predominantly rural borough, and that's why we choose to live here. In my view, development should be limited to that required to meet the LOCAL needs, not to facilitate migration/movement from other areas.

Not a TMBC policy decision, but I am generally against pursuing policies that result in significant population growth, as it leads to pressure for homes and infrastructure that would see the natural landscape change in a way I consider negative. I feel migration should be limited to those in genuine need, which will be balanced by the falling birth rate of those already here. That should allow much easier allocation of necessary sites for your Local Plan.

Historic communities such as Wateringbury must not be developed further and no adjacent developments must worsen traffic, speeding and pollution.

---

**User Response: Text**

Maintain and improve amenity Re historic environment

Economic growth to support HMG plan

Traffic is a major threat to communities regards safety and pollution . 20mph in built up, community and villages is a cheap option, no downside and there are no other affordable solutions

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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, other urban land and brownfield sites.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Climate Change is an obvious selection given the dire situation the planet faces. The green belt and ANOB play significant role in the local emphasis on climate change and should along with the overall sustainability of any of the sites chosen be at the forefront of the priorities set for the local plan.

They are important to have the least negative effect on the area

currently I feel development is all about housing with little or no regard to an actual strategy. Facilities and infrastructure need to be a priority in order to 'glue' development together with some coherence. We need to protect our greenbelt which gos hand in hand with protecting our existing communities and their identity and more than ever the natural environment is essential as it is the bedrock of the communities within which we live.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces corp production and biodiversity), frequent Tooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy theses spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulSIs all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;



---

## User Response: Text

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the

---

**User Response: Text**

need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

GREEN BELT - It is imperative to protect MGB land. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

---

**User Response: Text**

- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

OTHER (AGRICULTURAL) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education are under stress and have deteriorated badly over many years. Our roads are in bad condition and congested.

The natural environment matters to health and well-being .

Infrastructure is already stretched and more burden will be made on local roads in particular.

Other ( agriculture) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

Green belt - It is vital to protect metropolitan green belt land at all costs. The NGB around Tonbridge fulfils all these requirements laid down in the NPPF.

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

to assist in the safeguarding of 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

Community facilities and urban infrastructure - facilities sin health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Common sense !!!

---

## User Response: Text

There is a climate emergency- this needs action now.  
The natural environment, including the green belt needs to be protected and enhanced.

You've only given me three options not to list them in order of preference. All are important except the nonsensical climate change one as it matters not one jot what you think you can do there. The three I have chosen would occupy my first three strategic questions to be asked on going forward.

Climate change must underpin every aspect of planning as it is inescapable and escalating. Decent housing as a basic right must go hand in hand with sufficient facilities and infrastructure

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo

Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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

---

## User Response: Text

home-grown food.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Green belt, countryside, open spaces, existing woodland, preserving habitats for wildlife, plants and air quality need to be prioritised.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

---

**User Response: Text**

to maintain and preserve the rural environment

I think it is very hard to just chose three as so many are important! Climate change is fundamentally important and should be the basis on everything that is decided - they type of properties, the management of transport, the protection of green spaces which help to mitigate the effects of carbon emissions.

Similarly the natural environment must be respected and protected. I believe Green Belt falls under this heading! Our natural environment is important for our mental health, for our physical health, to combat the impact of carbon emissions, to protect and preserve our wildlife. It should play a part in how our transport system is designed - not least the provision for active travel - and managed, and how new homes are built.

And as for Community Facilities and infrastructure, this again interrelates with the issues of climate change and natural environment.

East Malling is a beautiful village with many ancient and listed buildings and lovely rural surroundings as am sure are many Kent villages. there are inadequate local GP services, schools and homes suitable for young people or the elderly

Maintaining the Green Belt is a priority. The climate and health of those living in the South east will suffer if urbanisation of the green belt is permitted.

The borough should concentrate on representing existing local residents for who the borough exist to serve, not potential or "possible" residents who based on statistics are more likely to come from outside the borough.

These therefore are community facilities and the green environment as this has a direct link to the physical and mental health of the population.

Birth rates and and immigration are falling, natural environment is at risk due to climate change and human effects.

House building should be at the level required by the borough not a national target, and based on level and type of need in the borough only.

Social housing should be explicitly stated in this document and a limit to certain housing sizes (5+ bed houses should be explicitly rejected by this plan)

Existence of community facilities does not translate to capacity, this includes the schools, shops, GP, drainage, Roads and telecommunications. None of these have capacity in the Hildenborough area.

Green belt (for preserving the Natural environment and agricultural land) exist for a reason and it is more important than housing. Green belt exists to preserve both this green space and our urban environments as distinct spaces, reducing sprawl and coalescence. This has a secondary benefit of protecting biodiversity, limiting climate change and improving human health.

---

### User Response: Text

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

I believe that Climate Change and Natural Environment should be prioritised, in order to contribute to wider Government objectives and commitments around net zero and Building Back Greener, and to show consideration to the "Climate Emergency" that is beginning to dominate other issues in terms of importance - particularly with regard to the Borough's Vision for 2040, which covers almost the entire period between now and 2050 of the government 2050 targets.

I also believe Community facilities and Infrastructure are important, and whilst I would have liked to include Transport (public transport etc.) in the above list of three items, I am limited to three, and I consider community facilities and infrastructure to include improved transport infrastructure, at least to some extent addressing the issue of transport; and Climate Change covering improvements in public transport, which again covers Transport to some extent.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rainwater for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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

---

**User Response: Text**

setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

We must preserve our heritage and green belt .

You cannot develop the increase the housing supply unless the infrastructure is there to support it.

I'm based on Kings Hill - believe this area is known as a garden Village not a urban development

Local plan will ruined the environment and nature around or even whats left of it.

We must grow our own staple foods as much as possible. Countryside must be preserved. We must preserve the character of historic Tonbridge.

Focus on maintaining the green areas and promotion of good public transport to all users

Climate change first and foremost as it is an emergency right now.

Green Belt - to preserve our natural environment and agricultural land for the future. - it cannot be undone.

Community facilities and infrastructure - most important for our day to day lived experience.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the



---

**User Response: Text**

wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The needs of local residents must always be a priority concern.

To preserve the countryside, green spaces and the little villages of England

Climate change and the costs of energy need to underpin every planning decision. Looking ahead to a greener future means that any new housing must meet high standards in terms of being carbon neutral. Transport links must be improved so that more people use buses, trains bicycles and trams instead of the car. Greener spaces for everyone should be in place - the temptation for builders is to squeeze in as many houses as possible without thinking of the needs of the residents. There should be outside spaces (squares and cafes) in which people can gather and meet informally. Elderly or disabled residents should not be isolated in their homes by poor transport links or lack of shared communal spaces.

To maintain the current quality of life for the residents and keep the AONB.

Green belt and AONBs for natural environment and providing a place for town dwellers to take respite. Transport links including good bus routes to take people out of their cars and good community facilities for obvious reasons.

---

## User Response: Text

- **Refer answer to Q. 9 i.e.**

‘Health and wellbeing’ are missing and these are issues that must be addressed by the Local Plan. All must be provided for and/or require some sort of change or development.

However:

- Climate change
- Natural environment
- Built and historic environment
- Green Belt

These are the framework and constraints within which development must be provided. They are issues that must be addressed in relation to the impact of the development being planned for.

**These 4 ‘strategic matters’ must therefore be the priorities.** Everything needs to be tested against these issues. After applying these 4 ‘strategic matters’ development priorities should be:

- Community facilities and infrastructure
- Economic development
- Housing

because if these are provided properly in accordance with the needs of the Borough they cover the other ‘strategic matters’ of;

- Retail
- Tonbridge (as the borough’s principal town centre)
- Transport

Community facilities and infrastructure - it is vital that proper account is taken of the impact of the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate the additional pressure put on them as a result of developments. For example, Hadlow cannot take an increase in demand for medical services as the GP surgery is fully (or over) subscribed, the roads need to be capable of handling increased traffic volumes, and so on.

Green Belt and natural environment - there is so much pressure on these. Nature and the climate are both in crisis. All planning **MUST** make this an absolute priority - above anything else.

Climate change is the single biggest threat to our planet and way of life and critically must be addressed. The built environment has one of the greatest opportunities to do this.

As a conservation accredited engineer I work with historic buildings and settings and believe they are of paramount importance to protect - once lost they are gone forever. They have also been proven to resonate with people, giving a sense of purpose and place adding significantly to wellbeing.

Community facilities and infrastructure are crucial to allow efficient working patterns, and support work life balance.

---

**User Response: Text**

Please see most recent comment above

Protecting the rural character of the borough and its green belt should be a priority. Development and economic growth should be centred around Tonbridge. Good, sustainable urban design and protection and enhancement of heritage assets are important

All 3 of my choices are based on maintaining a decent quality of life for current and future residents. If housing were prioritised over community health/education facilities, for example, then people's health, wellbeing and future prospects would suffer.

Once we've lost the greenbelt, once the environment has been damaged beyond a tipping point, everyone in the borough is affected. Prioritising environmental concerns and using the other strategic matters to support these is essential. That means no large developments on the greenbelt, ensuring all developments take environmental sustainability serious within their design, using existing infrastructure to support growth.

Community facilities and infrastructure - Infrastructure and facilities are already strained with the current needs which are already growing with out of town transfers of population, current housing development and population.

Green Belt - The fundamental aim of Green belt is to conserve and protect our land and areas of outstanding natural beauty from being subject to urban sprawl and development. It is the land that protects biodiversity, helps battle climate change and preserves the setting and special character of our villages and towns. In my view, Greenbelt covers climate change and natural environment - without it you don't have the latter!

Transport - Transport is already under great strain with rising fuel costs, rising population and inadequate roads and services. The system is strained now and is only going to get worse.

The borough contains some of the most beautiful village and landscape in the world. These are what make the area unique and give it it's defining characteristics on which its communities are based.

We should aim to protect this as much as we can while, of course, balancing with the need to support new build and the great demand for housing - it is not reasonable for those lucky to have housing to refuse any more built in their backyard.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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

---

**User Response: Text**

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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested. Q

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces. GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

Community facilities and infrastructure - Infrastructure and facilities are already strained with the current needs which are already growing with out of town transfers of population, current housing development and population. Green Belt - The fundamental aim of Green belt is to conserve and protect our land and areas of outstanding natural beauty from being subject to urban sprawl and development. It is the land that protects biodiversity, helps battle climate change and preserves the setting and special character of our villages and towns. In my view, Greenbelt covers climate change and natural environment - without it you don't have the latter! Transport - Transport is already under great strain with rising fuel costs, rising population and inadequate roads and services. The system is strained now and is only going to get worse.

Community facilities and infrastructure - Infrastructure and facilities are already strained with the current needs which are already growing with out of town transfers of population, current housing development and population. Green Belt - The fundamental aim of Green belt is to conserve and protect our land and areas of outstanding natural beauty from being subject to urban sprawl and development. It is the land that protects biodiversity, helps battle climate change and preserves the setting and special character of our villages and towns. In my view, Greenbelt covers climate change and natural environment - without it you don't have the latter! Transport - Transport is already under great strain with rising fuel costs, rising population and inadequate roads and services. The system is strained now and is only going to get worse.

---

### User Response: Text

There is no mention of Health & Wellbeing in the strategic matters that is a key Fault .

The priorities for the local plan would be :-

Climate change

Green Belt - AONB

Natural environment

Built & Historic environment

These four points should be the key criteria for assessing a planned development.

All other criteria's would need to be assessed against these key points i.e.

Economic development, Housing, Community & infrastructure.

Retail & Transport would be covered under the above automatically.

Hard to choose between above options as all are important. But climate change especially needs to be prioritised by preserving green spaces.

1, Ensuring the infrastructure is capable of supporting the existing communities, our schools, healthcare, roads and transport are all requiring improvements to improve our quality of life.

2, Green Belt should remain just that and must be fully protected and retained for our and future generations to enjoy.

3, Natural Environment. We are so lucky to have the countryside on our doorstep as well as the River Medway both with reasonable access to take in the natural environment. All that can be done to both maintain and increase accessibility should be done.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

---

### User Response: Text

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

If we don't consider climate change the rest are pointless, we have a responsibility to do everything we can as part of this planning process to positively impact and protect the environment by preserving green spaces which are

---

### User Response: Text

vital to maintaining our ecosystem

The Greenbelt supports the point above as well as fulfilling the points made above in qn.4 The Greenbelt encompasses the historic environment, nature and community facilities in terms of access to rural areas.

Economic development, retail and Tonbridge as the town centre all need better more environmentally friendly Transport options which are sustainable not short term. The current road system is old and options for expansion are very limited and likely to make things worse as already seen near the station. Other options of transport need to be considered.

Our local schools and healthcare provision are already stressed

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The integrity of the Borough needs to be preserved.

---

**User Response: Text**

They are the greatest threats to our way of life and existence.

A fast train line connecting Borough Green to London is long overdue. The natural environment and green belt should be protected as a priority.

GREENBELT - It is vital to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt and restrict urban sprawl.

CLIMATE CHANGE - Development of green belt will increase flooding risk in what is already a high risk area, and reduce the ability of the local environment to cope with climate stresses.

**(outline briefly)?**

All strategic matters should be identified together with the addition of health and well-being as it forms strategic Objective 1 'To improve human health and wellbeing' of the interim Sustainability Appraisal Report. This is a key piece of evidence supporting the plan. Health clearly forms a key theme throughout this evidence document and is also a key theme throughout the NPPF. This should include the health and wellbeing of older people.

the impact of climate change, and the impact of development on climate change are intrinsically linked, therefore the built environment and natural environment are key to addressing the impacts of climate change. Through brownfield development in urban areas, adaptive re-use of existing buildings and construction of energy efficient new housing using MMC is key to addressing the strategic matters.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), increasingly frequent flashflooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconstruction of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we



---

**User Response: Text**

can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfil all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

i believe it is imperative that we preserve our greenbelt and natural environment wherever possible and also to ensure that current transport facilities supports the volume of traffic that is already on the roads in a fit and reasonable state. Many of the country roads are not fit for purpose and should be repaired and improved.

Please see previous comments for reasons.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b)

---

**User Response: Text**

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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested

These matters have been selected as these are most pertinent to cross boundary issues.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces. GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down

---

**User Response: Text**

in the NPPF: (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. TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The Tonbridge & Malling area has a high concentration of historical sites and areas of outstanding beauty. Whilst it is understood there is a housing need, the plan must give enhanced importance to retaining the environmental and historical characteristics of the area and preserve the strategic hierarchy.

Environment and Climate emergency are the foremost issues that should take all our energy.

Other human activities will not take place without the above being solved first.

Sunak has just said so as he u turned about attending COP 27

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

We are fortunate to live in a special part Kent which needs to be maintained and developed sympathetically, when necessary, in order to ensure we manage the impact of climate change and quality of life for our citizens into the

---

**User Response: Text**

future.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

Preservation of the Green Belt is essential, as is land for agricultural purposes, for future generations and food security, Ease of access to and from shops, schools and work is essential for proper enjoyment of the lived environment. Avoidance and, where possible, elimination of air pollution is essential for healthy living.

Because action against climate change should be the priority for all, the negative effects of climate change are far reaching for all and should be addressed in any way possible to mitigate the impact we as humans are having on earth.

The preservation of the green belt areas and CO2 absorbing trees is critical to reducing air pollution levels as well as retaining all important biodiversity, and as previously detailed to stop the spread of urban developments and retain the character of historic towns.

Again as outlined previously the traffic in and around Tonbridge is already an issue and there seem to be no end of roadworks which just exacerbates the issue. With reduced bus services and little being done to encourage the reduction of short car journeys, this should be another strategic priority to reduce pollution and increase air quality.

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate Change.

And from that:

green belt

biodiversity

air quality

public health

effective transport links

enabled local community (socially and financially)

drought/flood protection

quality and technological adoption for building development

We need to preserve, protect and respect our local environment for future generations. It is an AONB with a great deal of biodiversity with many village communities. That is why residents have chosen to live here.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo

Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create '15 minute communities' to minimise the need to drive and to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. Time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The Plan is dedicated to providing housing and adding the services to support as an afterthought. The

---

### User Response: Text

preservation of existing Greenbelt is vital to the health and lifestyle of the existing occupants of the borough. To further develop the essentially rural communities investment in the existing community infrastructure is required. Many drains, road networks and transport links would not cope with increased numbers. Society has driven more centralised retail and leisure centres, leaving local communities without these essential services. Further housing in isolated communities will put increased pressure on the existing communities.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by Climate Change and the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15-minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to

---

**User Response: Text**

place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The Government assessed housing need imposes a 30% increase to the number of dwellings which is not justified by TMBC's own housing need; This assessed housing need must be based on significant migration into the Borough e.g. from London. As such far from addressing the affordability crisis for TMBC residents it makes it worse as such a great uplift could only be met through the development of large sites which attract buyers from London and SE London who can realise more value for money within Tonbridge and Malling. As communities across the Borough will confirm, the addition of recent new major developments has already put critical pressure on local infrastructure and services

CLIMATE CHANGE - Everyone should be mindful of climate change and the impact on our society and infrastructure.

AGRICULTURE - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

Green Belt should be used for development as a last resort once all other avenues have been exhausted. Transport links such as rail and bus routes and their timetables need to be reviewed and improved prior to any additional development within Hildenborough. Whilst community facilities and infrastructure exist, they are under extreme pressure in Hildenborough. The existing capacity needs to be fully understood prior to any development relying on access to them/use of them.

Preservation of the Green Belt is essential, as is land for agricultural purposes, for future generations and food security. Ease of access too and from shops, schools and work is essential for proper enjoyment of the lived environment. Avoidance and, where possible, elimination of air pollution is essential for healthy living.

Climate change - obvious reasons, we are in the middle of a serious climate crisis

Community facilities and infrastructure - public services need to be protected and enhanced for the good of us all.

Tonbridge - the principal town centre is already suffering from the withdrawal of major retailers reducing

---

**User Response: Text**

employment opportunities as well as less economic activity locally.

We cannot blur the area into a sprawl of developments; the MGB/AONB and environment need to be noticeably different from more urban areas

Built & Historic Environment: Heritage Assets need to be protected including Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas

Community facilities and infrastructure: With an increase in development, this is needed

Green Belt: To prevent developments merging into one huge conurbation eg a Green Belt is needed between East Malling, West Malling & Kings Hill

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Please see 1st two paragraphs answered in Question 10 above, i.e entitled

Community Facilities and Infrastructure

Green Belt

[Unable to copy and paste into the right box. I hope this is acceptable]

TMBC has a special charm about it, I don't want this to be concreted over.

The climate crisis will only be addressed by active citizens and everyone contributing by reducing their impacts as far as possible. Securing a local and sustainable energy supply is a priority for me and my family.



---

**User Response: Text**

Greenbelt: as a young family in the local area, the green belt land and natural environment has been incredibly important for the wellbeing, not only to my sons but as a mother who has suffered severe depression and anxiety. We live in close proximity to the greenbelt and having such mental health issues have specifically moved to this area in order to improve this. It is important to teach the next generation on preservation of our greenbelt areas to protect wildlife, biodiversity, farming and the increasingly worrying climate change situation which we cannot afford to ignore.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Transport: Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

Community facilities & infrastructure: Please see answer in Q6

All are important But Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to *guide* your demand for housing

BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT preserve special character of Tonbridge town centre

GREEN BELT preservation is important for well being of human and animal and plant life, as well as important for the local economy, as visitors enjoy these open spaces.

TRANSPORT Public transport/cycling/walking should be encouraged and not new road construction

As stated all are important but maintaining the character of the area is of greatest importance to me.

Mental health and obesity crisis in England is not helped by building over our green spaces.

We are not protecting our current environment and communities. We do not have the infrastructure to support the housing we currently have.

We need improved public transport and more cycle lanes

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate change is real and is having major impacts on the whole world. We cannot escape it and must face it head on in all walks of life. We must engage with environmental specialists to ascertain what factors to consider when planning towns. Think about drainage, plants and trees that absorb as much CO2 and water (to combat flash flooding) as possible, and employ green technologies and green energy development strategies.

We must also think holistically about improving towns as a whole, ensuring facilities and access for all the new homes you are planning.

The natural environment is being devastated at every turn, yet holds the key to balancing out our human impact on the world. We need support for farmers and agriculture to feed us all (anyone heard about the food crisis?) and the natural environment is not only inherent to ensuring pollination of crops, but for our mental health and wellbeing.

To protect the green belt.

please include "Built and historic environment selected to protect the quality and character of the built environment."

Infrastructure, as previously highlighted, is woefully inadequate and problems will be exacerbated unless infrastructure is given priority". "Natural environment is essential when facing an ecological crisis.

We need more housing but this must not impact adversely on climate change and there needs to be sufficient infrastructure to cater for the additional population.

Climate change needs to be tackled.

Less people in rural communities will help as less travel needed and better public transport.

Maintain green spaces and farmland reduce carbon emissions.

Mainly because these have been neglected for years to the detriment of the areas.

CLIMATE CHANGE – We need to ensure all future development is based on 15 minute communities and that sustainable transport links are delivered. We cannot simply continue to expect more cars to gridlock our roads and worsen air quality in our towns and villages

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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

---

**User Response: Text**

character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can tackle to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

I do not want any of the Green Belt to be taken away for the development of houses, businesses or public amenities., nor any of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to be encroached on.

I do not want any farming land to be used for housing because we will need to grow more of our own produce in the coming years, and these farm lands often abut the Green Belt and AONB.

Building within Tonbridge would allow residents to have the unspoilt countryside outside Tonbridge to enjoy and travel to either on foot or on bikes, if they are able bodied.

Tonbridge has fallen way down as the principal town centre in the Borough. Banking, retail and environment have fallen way below the basic standards of any principal town. There is employment and education and transport to attract new residents but little reason to shop and spend leisure time in the town centre which is neglected and run down.

All should be "priorities". The difficulty lies in balancing them all at a strategic level and on a case-by-case basis.

There is a climate emergency- this needs action now.  
The natural environment, including the green belt needs to be protected and enhanced.

climate change is fundamental - the policy must address this in a robust manner. The natural environment and green belt define the character of the borough, and must be protected

Given the likelihood that climate change is going to be an on-going and ever growing problem we need to have resilient infrastructure and we need to protect the natural environment as being the main way of removing CO2 from the atmosphere

---

### User Response: Text

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces. GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse. One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

Increasing housing delivery is a particularly important strategic matter for the Council to align with the “Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes” (NPPF, paragraph 60). In “boosting the supply of homes” and delivering over and above the OAHN, it will allow affordability to improve across the Borough (currently at 13.39 which is higher than the Kent average). At the same time, it is vital that community facilities and the associated level of infrastructure is delivered alongside the housing and in the expectation that sites/land will be delivered in locations that can build on and enhance existing local services/infrastructure, ie, adjacent to settlements, this approach will ensure the Local Plan can deliver sustainable development.

Climate change is effecting us all and we need to tackle this now before it is too late. We need to ensure the greenbelt

is respected and can ensure that nature is allowed the thrive

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;

---

### User Response: Text

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to

place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

Borough Green is a rural village and it should remain so. If you start building on greenbelt land we lose our natural environment and local people will suffer. We cannot take too many houses as the local infrastructure will suffer. The train line into London is already busy and it is hard to get appointments with the local doctors.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;

---

**User Response: Text**

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

We chose our priorities on the basis that people firstly need somewhere to live, and once they have that they need facilities to support them and somewhere where they can work.

Climate change is also important and new houses should be built with all possible energy saving/green credentials e.g. solar glass etc. wherever that is possible.

Preserving the green belt and keeping the essentially rural nature of the borough.

It's what makes the borough a desirable place to live.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Climate Change- To save the planet

Green Belt- Preserving its openness is critically important

AONB- Preserving the innate beauty of these areas is critically important. They must be preserved such that urban and country dwellers can escape to beautiful areas for fresh air and exercise.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

---

### User Response: Text

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. Time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate Change: number one priority for the world, and COP/national targets will only be achieved if they are prioritised in every local plan. It also informs all the other strategic matters.

Natural Environment: as mentioned earlier in this plan, the borough benefits from some beautiful landscapes along with farms which help feed the nation. With the increased need for food security, it is therefore important that this is given priority for TMBC's future plans.

Other: see answer to Q10.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT - this is a huge contributor to health and well-being and we should seek to preserve green spaces wherever possible.

**All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing**

Tonbridge is the principal town with good rail network but bus routes have been cut and are expensive. All opportunities to sensitively develop the town center and any brownfield sites, should be taken before considering green belt areas which are precious to the community and to the environment. Pressure on schools and medical centers should be taken into consideration before development is agreed.

See previous answers regarding infrastructure and the environment

1. Built and historic environment - because it is what makes our borough special.



---

**User Response: Text**

2. community facilities and infrastructure - because this is what keeps the borough being what it is, and not allowing it to slide into an urban sprall.

3. green belt - see 1 above.

The natural environment and green belt are one of the biggest draws to the area, improving access to these areas with better facilities is essential.

Developers are only interested in profiting from building houses with no care for the local environment or impact on existing communities. Building on greenbelt land is detrimental to the environment and once built on, is lost forever.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The

---

### User Response: Text

MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new

development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the

reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo

Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

---

**User Response: Text**

Climate change is a pressing consideration for us all to save our world. Green Belt to keep beautiful areas where people can visit to relax and enjoy the natural world. Community facilities and infrastructure to ensure people can live happily.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Schools, doctors and dentists are under particular pressure already. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Our natural environment is precious - once it's gone, It's gone. It's not only essential for growing our own produce and reducing food miles, it's also essential for the mental health of the population. The council must focus on developing already urban areas with a better infrastructure, public transport, road system, shops, GP's, etc rather than concreting over green spaces.

The protection of green belt, historic and natural environments is the fundamental focus, bringing sustainability and ecology benefits to fight climate challenges. Green space provides the environment to promote physical and mental health

Protecting and enhancing the natural environment of the district is our key legacy for the future - it is exceptionally difficult to reverse environmental decline.

Sustainable development requires development of sufficient local community services and infrastructure to minimise the need to travel. This also protects the interests of an ageing population, and people on lower incomes, who are less able to travel.

When there is a need to travel, the need to use a car should be minimised, due to the damage caused even by electric vehicles - space for parking, road construction, traffic congestion, road safety problems. This means investing in public transport between towns and villages, and walking/cycling infrastructure in larger towns such as Tonbridge.

Most of our recent developments have S106 agreements attached to the planning conditions, but the enforcement of these conditions is somewhat lacking, which means that, although housing has been completed, the agreements

---

**User Response: Text**

have not been adequately implemented.

There has been a consistent record of under-delivery of housing in the Borough resulting in a poor housing land supply position. The Housing Delivery Test 2021 measurement reveals that Tonbridge and Malling delivered only 63% of their requirement.

Tonbridge must be considered for further development as the principal town.

The constraint of the Green Belt is the largest obstacle to accommodating development in the most sustainable manner. In particular, the Green Belt around Tonbridge must be reviewed as a priority.

See response to Q2

Climate change is the biggest threat to us all, greenbelt must be protected, there are enough empty premises that can built on, empty industrial estates etc, don't build on the green areas

The housing target feels like an top down target that is imposed due to a prolonged period of house building failure by Government. There are lots of examples of housing developments where there are no facilities or local amenities and the quality of those developments suffers as a result. I don't have a lot of faith in the Section 106 funding for local improvements. It seems quite a toothless part of a council's arsenal.

I am not opposed to development but it needs to be considered and sustainable for all concerned.

Climate change should be a the top of any building plan and not building on green belt, greenfield or agricultural land. The local community facilities and infrastructure should also be at the forefront of any building in small rural villages

Natural environment should include risks from flooding and land slip, use of areas for farming and soil quality and protection of flora and fauna with use of the green belt system to limit development and maintain green corridors between built on areas.

Community infrastructure should involve appropriate use of affordable and reliable public transport and proviso of facilities such as secondary schools and GP surgeries that reduce the need for travel and use of vehicles.

The Green Belt becomes more and more important as developmental pressures increase. To weaken or broach it now would be irresponsible in the extreme. Also particularly the northern parts of the borough are under developmental pressures from outside the borough. In particular I cannot discern any concern in the Local Plan

---

## User Response: Text

on the inevitable increase in traffic when the Lower Thames Crossing is built (and that will surely be within the Local Plan timeframe). The increased traffic will affect the A227, the A20 and the M20 and all surrounding and connecting roads. Improving the road structure may assist the traffic flow - which is already not flowing at heavy times of the day - but any further road widening or dual carriageways in the area will adversely affect its rural character .

I believe that protecting the environment and the green belt is vitally important. Increasing the number of houses in the way outlined will decrease the quality of life for everyone locally. It will result in overcrowding of the villages, lack of green space and green belt and result in extra pollution. The beautiful village lanes (without streetlights which in turn aids the wildlife), the beauty of the wildflowers and wildlife will be decimated to extinction. Heritage of the small villages will be lost forever.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfill all the requirements laid down in the National Policy Framework:

- (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.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT- The ecosystem services provided by the natural environment are the bedrock of human society. If we keep destroying it, we are destroying our own society.

1. The choice of these three key strategic matters is supported by paragraph 20 of the NPPF which states:

*“20. Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision for:*

1. *a) **housing (including affordable housing)**, employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development;*
2. *b) infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);*
3. *c) community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure); and*
4. *d) **conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment**, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and **planning measures to address climate change mitigation and***

---

## User Response: Text

### adaptation.”

1. Delivery of housing and affordable housing is particularly important in Tonbridge & Malling due to the already poor (13.39) and worsening affordability ratio that exists in the Borough as a result of a lack of sufficient housing delivery over the past 10 -15 years.
  1. This position can only be addressed if there is a step change in the delivery of new housing to ensure that the identified needs are at least met but preferably exceeded through the adoption of the need plus 10% quantum option.
  2. It is of course recognised that if housing provision is to be a key strategic priority (which it must), it will be necessary to pay equal regard to how this housing delivery may come forward in terms of its impact upon the Boroughs natural environment and the wider national and global issues associated with the impacts of climate change.
  1. In this context it is considered that whilst very clearly sites will need to be developed that are ‘Greenfield’ and currently Green Belt, there should be an emphasis on the protection of sites which are of greatest importance such as AONB’s special landscape areas, sites with high biodiversity value etc.
  1. Similarly significant weight should be placed upon the actual delivery of biodiversity enhancements / net gain as part of the allocation process. For example, sites which can physically deliver net gains should be prioritised ahead of those where only monetary contributions / credits are proposed by way of mitigation.
7. Alongside this and in a similar vein, delivery of sustainable new homes which address issues of climate change should be prioritised

It is clear that environmental integrity and the response to climate change both in terms of adaptation, resilience and mitigation are the big issues for humanity during the rest of this century.

Best fit local needs

### **Climate Change**

Risks associated with climate change. Changing seasons- reducing crop production. Frequent flooding- urgent issue especially in Tonbridge.

### **Greenbelt**

Greenbelt preservation helps reduce the risks posed by Climate Change. It is important for wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. Visitors enjoy these spaces bringing money into economy.

### **Transport**

Tonbridge struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. We need to place active travel at heart of new developments.

---

**User Response: Text**

To save the planet

Creating more and more new homes is only one solution, a family/ house holder needs provisions, shops, work, transport, doctors, schools etc etc and green spaces to enjoy. Kings Hill is already his and expanding, and King Hill development only just being built, our area already is providing many more new homes on green space, green belt. More new home if needed should go in derelict building, towns and area already built up with suitable infrastructure.

Natural environment – is critical for preventing settlement coalescence, protecting biodiversity and sustainability

Community Facilities & Infrastructure – the current facilities (doctor surgeries / school buses / dentists etc) are insufficient to meet current demand never mind adding additional burden. Parking is also a significant issue in areas such as Kings Hill.

Meeting the local housing need as set by the standard method is the key priority facing TMBC. To allow for future growth it is essential that appropriate transport, community facilities and infrastructure are planned for. However, an appropriate balance should be struck between all the strategic matters.

The practicalities of being able to service the utilities , transportation, educational and safety issues caused by any proposed development.

Green Belt land should only be used for development as a last resort once all other Brownfield sites have been exhausted.

The infrastructure particularly regarding transport requires to be improved to ensure that there is adequate public transport both bus and rail to serve the existing community.

Climate Change- To save the planet

Green Belt- Preserving its openness is critically important

Natural Environment- The Council should be aiming for 20% biodiversity. The State of Nature in Kent report (July 2022) <https://kentnature.org.uk/state-of-nature/> (funded by LWT, KCC and KPOG) sets out how we need to recognise that nature is vital for a happy, healthy society. How it reduces pollution and flooding and supports adaptation to climate change – including locking up carbon. How every effort needs to be taken to ensure no further loss or deterioration of key habitats. How bigger landscape-scale projects need to be delivered to join-up fragmented habitats and secure more land in conservation management - in order to help deliver an ambitious

---

**User Response: Text**

Nature Recovery Network, as enshrined in the new Environment Act.

Ultimately they are all key.

**GREENBELT** - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

**CLIMATE CHANGE** - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rainwater for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

**BUILT AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

Tonbridge and can be distinguished from other neighbouring towns such as Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells because of its very close proximity to beautiful farmland and countryside. From the town centre open countryside can be reached in a very short walk from Brook Street or Tonbridge School for example. It is a medieval market town with its rural villages and their historic links to the hop industry and fruit growing dating back to the 19th century. Development of the greenfield sites surrounding the town and villages will destroy this unique and very important characteristic of the town and the reason many residents chose to move here rather than Sevenoaks or Tunbridge Wells.

I have already stated the importance of agriculture for the nations health

Climate change - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including changing seasons (which reduces production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

Green Belt - preservation supports the point above but also important for the well-being of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces too. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the



---

### User Response: Text

NPPF:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-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.

Built & Historic Environment - Tonbridge is an historic town with a medieval castle and a rich history. Any development must not be allowed to spoil the views from or the views of the Castle and its historic location. The area around Priory Road was the site of a priory and development was allowed without a proper archaeological investigation of the area. Once built on, these sites are damaged and likely lost forever. Recent building work in a house in the town centre revealed what is thought to be a medieval drainage system. Sadly, the builder was allowed to proceed without any proper investigation being carried out. We should be safeguarding our history and not allowing money to speak louder.

The plan is for thousands of houses to be built. The strategy for delivering should have a clear focus on protection.

Community Facilities and infrastructure - we need to see education provision planned in a way which will release pressure on schools in South Tonbridge thus reducing the need for parents to drive children to school. We need to see health services and community facilities which are local to communities again reducing the need to travel further afield.

Natural Environment - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

Transport – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network within a complex river network. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many road routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

We need to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to create communities with suitable services locally and to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. Time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the buses in Kings Hill recently.

I think their importance is self evident!

---

## User Response: Text

Climate Change - The various risks associated and directly as a consequence of climate change like flooding, drought and loss of rain water must be addressed by any plan with an intention to mitigate for example by preserving green which captures carbon.

Green Belt - Its existence is absolutely essential to deter climate change. It is also hugely important for the physical and mental wellbeing of the community. Not only human but animal and plant population are positively affected.

The protection of Metropolitan Green Belt around Tonbridge is absolutely essential. It fulfils all requirements laid down in the NPFF.

Transport - As Tonbridge residents we feel the lack of proper wide road leading to the town centre has caused an exponential build up of congestion through the years. The ancient road network designed for horses and pedestrians struggles with even the current demand. New development associated with more traffic will render a clogged up town centre, where modifications may prove impossible like in South Tonbridge. New modifications for example in Shipbourne Road/London Road and will be required to tackle the daily congestions.

The effect building the proposed number of houses in the borough will have on the environment must have an effect on climate change and the extra demands on the infrastructure that is already under pressure must be taken into account. The pollution created coupled with extra demands on services will have a very detrimental effect on the area.

We have chosen the above three priorities for the following reasons:

### 1) Community Facilities and Infrastructure

To accommodate all the anticipated future growth in the new Local Plan to meet the 839 dwellings per annum (dpa), it is essential that a sufficient amount of community facilities and infrastructure is provided as part of the new Local Plan.

We consider that community facilities and infrastructure are the roots to all development and without this being implemented, this limits the capacity of the Borough to accommodate the level of growth required.

We request the Council produce an Infrastructure Delivery Plan as part of their Regulation 19 consultation evidence base to set out how this infrastructure will be delivered as this will have an impact on how much housing goes where in the Borough.

We also recommend community facilities and infrastructure is a priority within the new Local Plan.

### 2) Green Belt

In order to meet local development needs Green Belt release is essential. We recommend that the Council needs to acknowledge this from the outset in the Regulation 19 Local Plan. The Council's evidence base confirms that there is insufficient capacity within existing settlements to meet their identified need of 839 dpa.

The Council have set out that Exceptional Circumstances ('ECs') exist to justify alterations to the Green Belt and we recommend this should be a priority for the new Local Plan to ensure all development needs (housing, employment, community facilities and infrastructure) can be met in full within the Plan period, in the most sustainable and appropriate locations.

We also recommend that the need to release Green Belt is communicated to the community and to Councillor's to thoroughly understand the lack of reasonable alternatives to meet development needs.

---

**User Response: Text**

3) Housing

The Council must meet their housing needs in full, as a minimum.

The Council have seen an increase in their housing target to 839 dpa through the standardised methodology, therefore housing should be a key strategic matter for the new Local Plan to ensure housing needs can be met in full.

Quantum and distribution of housing (and all other forms of development) is key. In terms of quantum, housing must achieve full need, as a minimum. In terms of distribution, this must be balanced across the Borough.

If both quantum and distribution are not sound as part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, there will likely be knock-on effects and social, environmental and economic matters could be significant.

As set out in the Council's EC's Topic Paper, house prices in the Borough are some of the highest in Kent, and 30% more than national medians whilst earnings are around 11% less than national medians. This has resulted in a higher affordability ratio making it difficult for residents to purchase property in the Borough, especially first time buyers.

More housing is essential in the Borough to reduce the affordability ratio and ensure sufficient housing is available for all, therefore we recommend this should be a key priority in the new Local Plan.

No response

This is a beautiful part of our beautiful country and as such needs protecting. I neither trust Government strategies or Local Plans to do this. Yes we need housing but in areas where environment and disruption to existing infrastructure are not compromised.

All these options are important but at the end of the day if the place is swamped with car traffic all other aspects are undermined.

The Council's evidence (notably the Housing Needs Survey ('HNS')) demonstrates significant housing need across the authority area, with affordability and suitability of housing stock a significant concern. The provision of appropriate levels of housing, in the right location, type and tenure must therefore be central to the Local Plan. New homes must be supported by communities and infrastructure which serve their and existing communities' wider needs, including appropriate investment in public transport, active mode transport opportunities and highways. We do not consider other strategic matters to be unimportant, however.

To meet local needs whilst doing as much as possible to protect the planet

The area around London should remain both culturally and physically different from the metropolis. It is important to prioritise the natural environment while ensuring good community infrastructure for the existing population. The Green Belt is not a tool for "nimbys" but an important way of providing a cushion around London to prevent the concreting over of the SE corner of the UK.

---

**User Response: Text**

No response

They are applicable to where I live - in general I agree with the overall strategic needs of the plan but need to preserve the green belt and AONB for all.

If climate change is not addressed thoroughly and immediately there will be no 'local' for a plan. Loss of Green Belt has huge environmental impact. Housing - people need somewhere AFFORDABLE to live.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

CLIMATE CHANGE - Unless we all focus on this as a top priority, planning consultations will be irrelevant because we will not have a habitable planet to live on.

---

### User Response: Text

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

All are important. Reducing the list to 3 is a bit arbitrary. The 3 I have chosen are to with what I think matters most to the quality of life in the borough. Climate change of course is a different sort of factor. Pessimistic views talk about the earth shedding 5bn people in 40 the next years as the carrying capacity of the planet falls. This sort of prediction cuts across the life-time of this plan and will have all sorts of impacts that are outside the ability of TMBC to influence

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces. It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

#### COMMUNITY FACILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE

- Regarding the provision of healthcare facilities, it must be recognised that there is already an issue with insufficient provision of healthcare, it is hard to find trained medical staff.
- Transport as above
- Drainage systems capable of managing the existing levels of water are already insufficient, this will become far worse if the current services are not increased

To be fair they are all pretty important. Given we only have one planet and we are fast destroying our natural environment I'd say it is about time we prioritised that. We're in a climate and biodiversity emergency so how about we actually treat it as such and make those areas the focus.

---

**User Response: Text**

We really must not lose precious areas that impact the environment and wildlife and cultural heritage

Developments should be in harmony with the area they are built. Much of the checklist is already an issue, infrastructure etc, but it all starts with the protection of the natural/greenbelt/rural areas as if you develop them then that triggers other issues such as infrastructure etc which will then become even more of a major issue.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

In the midst of the nature and climate crisis it is essential that Local Plans are ambitious in their commitments to reduce reliance on carbon, offset residual carbon emissions through local habitat creation, protect and enhance the natural environment, leaving species and habitats in a better state at the end of the local plan period, and ensuring that existing and new residents re-connect with the natural environment, bringing health and wellbeing benefits.

Housing is not a strategic matter. It is the objective of the Local Plan. These strategies are to guide to TMBC's demand for housing

Flooding is already a serious concern in the borough and in other parts of the Medway Valley and wider catchment area. Further development within the floodplains will increase the risk of flooding in neighbouring areas and in downstream communities.

---

### User Response: Text

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - these are already at breaking point!

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

Ensuring the character and environment are enhanced and not spoiled by overdevelopment of all local open spaces

We have seen transport services in the area cut and not keeping up with requirements. Transport to Pembury hospital for example.

The roads have not considered development or the infrastructure to keep with planned growth of houses. This has shown strain on existing resources and no party (TMBC, KCC) have looked at this carefully enough.

We are at risk of flooding increasing in the area and there is no clear strategy to help existing housing with flooding risk – and we have seen more housing built on flood plans. There are areas in the Borough – like Borough Green which could easily take up additional housing as this is not linked to flooding.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. South East Water is operating on an emergency service only as there is poor infrastructure to stop water loss from reported leaks. There are 2 known water leaks in the Higham Wood area which have not been dealt with. Twice in October 2022 water supply was unavailable for 2 to 3 hours. Hose pipe bans are still in place. Local reservoirs continue to be low.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education and water supply have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

---

## User Response: Text

Paragraph 20 of the Framework states that:

*“Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision for:*

1. *a) housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development;*
2. *b) infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);*
3. *c) community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure); and*
4. *d) 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.”*

Given this, it is clear that Housing and Economic development should be the two most important strategic matters and should be a priority for Local Plan 2040. Whilst still important, the natural environment should be given the lowest priority. We consider that community facilities and infrastructure should be given the third highest priority since this goes hand in hand with growth i.e. there needs to be services and facilities to support the population and workforce.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT & NATURAL ENVIRONMENT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

We live in a beautiful area of Kent and soon there will be nothing left but housing estates. We watch programmes about species being destroyed in other lands and we are shocked. What about our own back yard? We are destroying everything we have. Mereworth is full of fields and narrow lanes and nature. Why destroy it all with housing and noise and light.

Stick to the already existing towns.



---

### User Response: Text

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Access to nature has proven health benefits, and helps deliver the Healthy Places priority of the NPPF.

The countryside should stay as natural as it can be, development should be kept around existing towns there is no reason to develop the green belt until the town's have been made better and much better public transport exists in the outer areas for access to the towns.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent Tooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all

---

**User Response: Text**

new developments across the borough.

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The local Plan of course needs to address future development needs of it's community . However it is imperative that in designing and implementing such plan it preserves as much of richness of heritage in Landscape , Natural diversity of environment and eco-systems and Historic Structures .Once sacrificed these cannot later be reclaimed , for future human generations but importantly the other inhabitants of our environment that we are custodians for.

Increasing housing delivery is a particularly important strategic matter for the Council to align with the “Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes” (NPPF, paragraph 60). In “boosting the supply of homes” and delivering over and above the OAHN, it will allow affordability to improve across the Borough (currently at 13.39 which is higher than the Kent average). At the same time, it is vital that community facilities and the associated level of infrastructure is delivered alongside the housing and in the expectation that sites/land will be delivered in locations that can build on and enhance existing local services/infrastructure, i.e., adjacent to settlements, this approach will ensure the Local Plan can deliver sustainable development.

Any new development should be accompanied by sufficient prior and/or concurrent investment in infrastructure, as current infrastructure in the area is insufficient.

In rural areas, active travel is not a viable option – roads are narrow and unsafe. Public transport is non-existent. People will still have two vehicles per household – council should consider greater provision of charging points?

These are the 3 imperatives that need to be got right, and they are all intricately linked. The thrust of the policies should be to maximise land use within Tonbridge Town Centre; if you do that, you minimise the amount of housing that needs to be provided elsewhere, and that in turn minimises the impacts on the Green Belt (and the wider natural environment).

It is important to retain the valuable green belt land around the Tonbridge area, many areas under consideration are productive agricultural fields which must be retained to assist in the supply of domestically produced foods and minimise the need for imports especially at this time of cost of living crisis

Sustainable future

I feel so strongly about conserving our green belt, protecting the natural environment and ensuring optimum

---

**User Response: Text**

biodiversity. Humans are not the only inhabitants of this planet. We must look after our green spaces for the overall good of the planet.

Previous plans have changed after they have been passed. ie the Green way Hall road Wouldham. Now a road. Green open space by the river now a pile of chalk & soil soon to be more houses.

Above everything our environment is the most important thing. Once green land is built on it is not easily undone and the rural nature of the area is lost forever. Housing impacts adversely in so many ways, reducing wildlife and insect populations, increasing pollution and rubbish which is already a huge issue in the borough. Land should be preserved for farming and re-wilding. There is a food and climate crisis.

The green belt is a key feature of the borough. If we wanted to live in an urban borough we could easily move to London!

Natural environment – is critical for preventing settlement coalescence, protecting biodiversity and sustainability  
Community Facilities & Infrastructure – the current facilities (doctor surgeries / school buses / dentists etc) are insufficient to meet current demand nevermind adding additional burden. Parking is also a significant issue in areas such as Kings Hill.

Community facilities and infrastructure go hand in hand with housing development and we need to be conscious of the pressures on our community facilities and infrastructure generated by proposed developments by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council in Capel etc.

I chose natural environment as we need to build a sustainable future and protect those valued open spaces we are fortunate to have in the Borough.

Key issue- infrastructure, particularly local transport

Natural environment-needs to be committed to biodiversity and reducing carbon expenditure

For any development to meet its sustainability objectives it needs to recognise the environment in which it is being proposed: to achieve SA 2. 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 (SA10); additional pavements and lighting along Claire Lane would cause damage to a distinct countryside environment impacting wildlife habitat (SA 5 and SA 6) through disruption of wildlife habitats and interruption of "darkskies" environments; the scale of the developments will materially impact what has been described in the "East Malling Conservation Study" as an areas of "Unspoilt beauty" and would disturb the distinct, historic characters of East Malling and West Malling villages

---

### User Response: Text

Regarding SA 11 and 12: 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)

Regarding SA 14: Of the proposed developments only a very small proportion are affordable to young buyers in the local demographic

In terms of local plots the proposed plots 59752, 59802, 59797, 59800 would all destroy areas of outstanding natural beauty, ancient woodland and their local natural habitat.

They will also absorb Wateringbury, as an other rural settlement into Kings Hill, an urban area, disrupting the settlement hierarchy principle.

Wateringbury, and in particular Canon Lane, will be hugely impacted by this in terms of traffic/water table issues where we saw a water drought this Summer without this major impact, so in effect this is a anti climate change measure which at first sight is not sustainable. In addition the lane is in effect single track.

To preserve the rural integrity of the borough

In an already densely populated area preservation of the green belt is essential

Any development must be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure or quality of life will be damaged

Without effective public transport increased private transport will cause major delays and damage to the environment

Agriculture - need to produce home grown food in uk.

community facilities- Education, healthcare and roads already under strain.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

---

### User Response: Text

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to

---

### User Response: Text

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfills all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconstruction of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

Climate Change. - The risks associated with climate change including changing seasons, frequent flooding, drought, loss of rainwater for reservoirs etc is therefore an urgent issue they any plan must address

Greenbelt - Preservation supports the point above but is also important for the wellbeing of human, animal and plant population in the area.

Transport - The roads around Tonbridge are old and designed for Pedestrian and horses. They struggle to cope with the Current demands from resident and will not be able to cope with any additional capacity

Climate change - Frequent flooding.

Green Belt- Important for the wellbeing of human, animal and plant population in the area.

Transport - Tonbridge struggles to cope with current demand, any new development will only make the situation worse.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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

---

**User Response: Text**

(e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Tonbridge has many historic buildings but it is not being protected sufficiently by planners. Green spaces in Tonbridge must be protected.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.



---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

(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.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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. GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF: (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. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

As outlined above, the NPPF sets clear parameters for what constitute strategic policies and what should feature in a plan. Given there is clarity on these matters we question the benefit in implying that there is an element of choice of which matters take priority.

As outlined above, the NPPF sets clear parameters for what constitute strategic policies and what should feature in a plan. Given there is clarity on these matters we question the benefit in implying that there is an element of choice of which matters take priority.

As set out in response to Q.2, Tonbridge should in our view be elevated in the settlement hierarchy to a 'Principal Town' ,

---

### User Response: Text

given its role and function within the borough and wider Housing Market Area. There are acute affordable housing shortfalls at this key town, which reduces its ability to retain a local economically active workforce in support of key social and economic needs, increasing the potential for unsustainable travel patterns. Redressing this through the Local Plan's spatial distribution options, by directing a greater proportion of growth to Tonbridge, and assessing the role adjacent settlement Hildenborough could play to support this further has many benefits. This is not to say the other matters aren't important, but these are the three we consider merit particular focus.

Alongside new homes it is essential that appropriate transport, community facilities and infrastructure are planned for to ensure there is capacity for growth. However, a balance between all the strategic matters needs to be found.

'Health and wellbeing' are missing and these are issues that must be addressed by the Local Plan. All must be provided for and/or require some sort of change or development.

However:

- ? Climate change
- ? Natural environment
- ? Built and historic environment
- ? Green Belt

These are the framework and constraints within which development must be provided. They are issues that must be addressed in relation to the impact of the development being planned for.

Unless exceptional circumstances prevail the Green Belt is a major constraint, the built and historic environment biodiversity, landscape and other elements of the natural environment e.g. soils, water etc. all require conservation and enhancement. Climate change must be mitigated and development needs to be planned to adapt and ensure carbon reduction. These 4 'strategic matters' must therefore be the priorities. Everything needs to be tested against these issues. That is what planning for development is all about. These priorities should act as the framework within which the allocations and spatial options are chosen and policies are developed.

After applying the 'strategic matters' i.e. the constraints of:

- ? Climate change
- ? Natural environment
- ? Built and historic environment
- ? Green Belt

The priority for providing development allocations and infrastructure within these 4 strategic matters/constraints identified above, development priorities should be:

- ? Community facilities and infrastructure
- ? Economic development
- ? Housing

because if these are provided properly in accordance with the needs of the Borough they cover the other 'strategic matters' of;

- ? Retail
- ? Tonbridge (as the borough's principal town centre)
- ? Transport

---

## User Response: Text

'Health and wellbeing' are missing, and these are issues that must be addressed by the Local Plan. All must be provided for and/or require some sort of change or development.

However:

- Climate change
- Natural environment
- Built and historic environment
- Green Belt

These are the framework and constraints within which development must be provided. They are issues that must be addressed in relation to the impact of the development being planned for.

**These 4 'strategic matters' must therefore be the priorities.** Everything needs to be tested against these issues. After applying these 4 'strategic matters' development priorities should be:

- Community facilities and infrastructure
- Economic development
- Housing

because if these are provided properly in accordance with the needs of the Borough they cover the other 'strategic matters' of;

- Retail
- Tonbridge (as the borough's principal town centre)

Transport

Gladman consider that housing, Green Belt, economic development, transport, and climate changes should be priorities within the Local Plan. These strategic matters combine to ensure that housing needs are met and can all be addressed through the allocation of suitable, sustainable residential development sites.

An opportunity exists to plan for new development in locations that encourage and enable sustainable lifestyles. Sustainable transport usage can be increased through suitably located development and the integration of different modes and infrastructure provision.

Fundamentally, the Council should ensure that they are planning for the new homes and jobs that TMBC needs, in sustainable and accessible locations, whilst supporting strong, healthy, and vibrant communities, protecting and enhancing the areas' natural, built and historic environments, fostering well-designed, beautiful safe places, and mitigating and adapting to climate change

- We would argue, of the matters listed the priorities should be: Natural Environment, Tonbridge Town & Transport Infrastructure
  - We do not agree that additional significant housing provision in the West Malling area is a priority Strategic Matter and questions the rationale for such housing increases proposed

## User Response: Text

- elsewhere across the Borough
- Analysis undertaken for BAG determined that in recent times, **it is estimated that the area within 1 mile of West Malling has absorbed 58% of new home building**
  - **The West Malling area represents just 1% of the 24013 hectares of Tonbridge & Malling Borough.**
  - The town is now in danger of being choked e.g. by traffic and lack of parking and infrastructure.
  - TMBC's estimated population in 2020 was 132,600 across 56,096 dwellings
    - The Government assessed housing need imposes a 30% increase to the number of dwellings which is not justified by TMBC's own housing need
    - **This assessed housing need must have been based on significant migration into the Borough e.g. from London**
  - Far from addressing the affordability crisis for TMBC residents it will make it worse as such a great uplift could only be met through the development of large sites which attract buyers from London and SE London who can realise more value for money within Tonbridge and Malling.
  - The housing within local communities should be for people already based in those communities, such as those new developments in areas such as Plaxtol.
  - As communities across the Borough will confirm, the addition of recent new major developments has already put critical pressure on local infrastructure and services

Need to protect environment ensure minimal harm to countryside protect the green belt ensure facilities an infrastructure can cope with new development.

The Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of Homes, as set out in NPPF paragraph 60. Moreover, the NPPF tests of soundness at NPPF paragraph 35 require Local Plans to be positively prepared which means, as a minimum meeting the objectively assessed needs, including housing, As set out in our answer to question 5, TMBC should be seeking to deliver 1,007 dpa. The failure to deliver sufficient housing can have serious social and economic consequences for the Borough and the wider area.

16 prepared which means, as a minimum meeting the objectively assessed needs, including housing, As set out in our answer to question 5, TMBC should be seeking to deliver 1,007 dpa. The failure to deliver sufficient housing can have serious social and economic consequences for the Borough and the wider area.

The Draft Plan are clear about the significance of the housing affordability issue across the Borough (see answer to question 5 for further details). Within this context, the delivery of affordable housing in line with the identified needs is significantly important to the Council.

Housing now is at the forefront of addressing climate change through its energy efficiency and surface water drainage programs and environmental enhancement through the implementation of BNG programs. It is the issue that normally gets the most commentary at a LP examination and the least credit for all it does, and needs to be prioritised accordingly. The land at Manor Farm is able to deliver new homes (including affordable homes) within the first five years of the Plan Period.

Quality of life for residents. Failure to consider climate change seriously will result in an unsustainable solution.

The required infrastructure needs to be in place before any additional housing is built.

Quality of life for residents. Failure to consider climate change seriously will result in an unsustainable solution.

---

**User Response: Text**

The required infrastructure needs to be in place before any additional housing is built.

We have chosen the above three priorities for the following reasons:

1) Community Facilities and Infrastructure

3.94 To accommodate all the anticipated future growth in the new Local Plan to meet the 839 dwellings per annum

(dpa), it is essential that a sufficient amount of community facilities and infrastructure is provided as part of the new

Local Plan.

3.95 We consider that community facilities and infrastructure are the roots to all development and without this being

implemented, this limits the capacity of the Borough to accommodate the level of growth required.

3.96 We request the Council produce an Infrastructure Delivery Plan as part of their Regulation 19 consultation evidence base to set out how this infrastructure will be delivered as this will have an impact on how much housing

goes where in the Borough.

3.97 We also recommend community facilities and infrastructure is a priority within the new Local Plan.

2) Green Belt

In order to meet local development needs Green Belt release is essential. We recommend that the Council needs to acknowledge this from the outset in the Regulation 19 Local Plan. The Council's evidence base confirms that there is insufficient capacity within existing settlements to meet their identified need of 839 dpa.

3.99 The Council have set out that Exceptional Circumstances ('ECs') exist to justify alterations to the Green Belt and

we recommend this should be a priority for the new Local Plan to ensure all development needs (housing, employment, community facilities and infrastructure) can be met in full within the Plan period, in the most sustainable and appropriate locations.

3.100 We also recommend that the need to release Green Belt is communicated to the community and to Councillor's to

thoroughly understand the lack of reasonable alternatives to meet development needs.

3) Housing

3.101 The Council must meet their housing needs in full, as a minimum.

3.102 The Council have seen an increase in their housing target to 839 dpa through the standardised methodology,

therefore housing should be a key strategic matter for the new Local Plan to ensure housing needs can be met in full.

3.103 Quantum and distribution of housing (and all other forms of development) is key. In terms of quantum, housing

must achieve full need, as a minimum. In terms of distribution, this must be balanced across the Borough.

3.104 If both quantum and distribution are not sound as part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, there will likely be knock-on

effects and social, environmental and economic matters could be significant.

3.105 As set out in the Council's EC's Topic Paper, house prices in the Borough are some of the highest in Kent, and

30% more than national medians whilst earnings are around 11% less than national medians. This has resulted in a higher affordability ratio making it difficult for residents to purchase property in the Borough, especially first time

---

**User Response: Text**

buyers.

3.106 More housing is essential in the Borough to reduce the affordability ratio and ensure sufficient housing is available

for all, therefore we recommend this should be a key priority in the new Local Plan.

As outlined above, the NPPF sets clear parameters for what constitute strategic policies and what should feature in a plan. Given there is clarity on these matters we question the benefit in implying that there is an element of choice of which matters take priority.

The three most important strategic matters are housing, transport and community facilities and infrastructure. Whilst climate change is clearly the most pressing global issue the extent to which the Local Plan can make a significant difference in this regard is necessarily limited. Providing housing to meet overall needs in the right location with the right community and transport infrastructure is the biggest challenge facing the Local Plan.

Housing is in our opinion a strategic matter that should be prioritised in the preparation of the Local Plan.

The failure to deliver sufficient housing can have serious social and economic consequences for the Borough and the wider area. In addition housing now is at the forefront of addressing climate change through its energy efficiency and surface water drainage programs and environmental enhancement through the implementation of BNG programs. It is the issue that normally gets the most commentary at a LP examination and the least credit for all it does, and needs to be prioritised accordingly.

The NPPF sets clear parameters for what constitute strategic policies and what should feature in a plan. Given there is clarity on these matters we question the benefit in implying that there is an element of choice of which matters take priority.

3.27 Housing delivery should be a key priority for TMBC with a minimum housing need of 15,941 dwellings across the Plan period up to 2040. However, housing growth should be accompanied by economic growth to ensure a balance between new homes and jobs. A focus on economic development is also particularly important to meet National, Regional and Local economic recovery objectives following the Covid-19 pandemic and boost economic output. In this way, the Marley Tiles site will provide a valuable contribution towards providing new high-quality B8 employment floorspace within the early part of the Plan period.

3.28 Another key priority should be Green Belt. In order to meet the development needs of the borough, TMBC will need to undertake a review of the Green Belt across the Borough to consider whether there is land currently located within the Green Belt which no longer serves the strategic purposes of the Green Belt and could be used to deliver sustainable development.

3.29 One such location which should be considered as part of this strategic Green Belt Review should be Major Developed Sites within the Green Belt including Nepicar Area West Major Developed Site. This includes brownfield land which is constrained by the Green Belt designation that washes over the employment allocation, arguably restricting the ability to

---

## User Response: Text

make the most effective use of this land. By releasing suitable brownfield sites within the Green Belt, this will put less pressure on locating development on sites which may be less suitable including greenfield sites. The Marley Tiles Site comprises brownfield land which is ideally located for distribution development given its proximity to the Strategic Road Network. However, there is concern that the current Green Belt designation would unduly constrain the potential to effectively use this Site for employment uses.

In line with paragraph 20 of the NPPF, strategic policies should be limited to those necessary to address the strategic priorities of the area (and any relevant cross-boundary issues), to provide a clear starting point for any non-strategic policies that are needed. Strategic policies should not extend to detailed matters that are more appropriately dealt with through neighbourhood plans or other non-strategic policies. With the above in mind, the plan should be more focussed on the strategic policies that it is proposing to introduce.

Increasing housing delivery is a particularly important strategic matter for the Council to align with the “Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes” (NPPF, paragraph 60). In “boosting the supply of homes” and delivering over and above the OAHN, it will allow affordability to improve across the Borough (currently at 13.39 which is higher than the Kent average). At the same time, it is vital that community facilities and the associated level of infrastructure is delivered alongside the housing and in the expectation that sites/land will be delivered in locations that can build on and enhance existing local services/infrastructure, i.e., adjacent to settlements, this approach will ensure the Local Plan can deliver sustainable development.

With regard to housing, the Framework (paragraph 60) sets out the Government has a clear objective of “significantly boosting the supply of homes” to ensure a “..sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed”. This is a clear government priority in an accepted housing crisis. Housing delivery of course also supports wider economic growth and development.

In relation to economic development, the Framework, at paragraph 81 confirms planning policies and decisions should help to create conditions for businesses to invest, expand and adapt, with significant weight placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity. Paragraph 82 continues requiring planning policies to set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth. At paragraph 82c) the Framework seeks to address barriers to investment in economies, such as inadequate infrastructure, services or housing. Therefore, economic development and housing delivery go hand in hand.

In terms of transport, the Framework requires infrastructure provision and development to be supported by infrastructure. Transport issues must be considered at an early stage of plan-making and opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure must be realised (paragraph 104 of the Framework).

Paragraph 20 of the Framework requires strategic policies to identify a strategy for making sufficient provision for infrastructure of transport.

Paragraph 105 of the Framework states:

“The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will

---

## User Response: Text

vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.”

Paragraph 3.79 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal is consistent with this, indicating that a growing population will create a substantial need for inter alia transportation infrastructure. In order to ensure that transport is a key aspect to ensure residents and workers can travel in, out and around the Borough in a time effective and sustainable manner, high quality infrastructure needs to be planned positively for, whilst transport can be a crucial methods in shifting towards a low carbon environment. Therefore, improving and increasing connectivity is a crucial strategic priority.

Question 10 sets out a list of potential priorities for the Local Plan, and invites respondents to select three that ‘mean the most to you’.

Vistry regard all the strategic matters identified as important and each will need to be addressed through the Plan. However, ‘Housing’ and specifically meeting objectively assessed needs in full, is the single most important strategic matter for the Plan. The importance of fully meeting housing needs is articulated in the Housing Needs Study (July 2022), which (at Section 3) depicts out the exponential growth in median house prices within Tonbridge and Malling, alongside correspondingly worsening levels of housing affordability

Related to the above, Vistry consider that the ‘Green Belt’ is another strategic matter that must be prioritised. In particular, the new Local Plan must release sufficient land from the Green Belt to ensure that housing and other needs are fully met. The ‘Urban Capacity Study’ (July 2022) and the ‘Green Belt Exceptions Circumstances (Strategic) Note’ (July 2022), confirm that there is insufficient previously developed / urban land to address housing needs. In the context of the scale of that need and in a climate of worsening affordability, exceptional circumstances exist to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt for residential development.

Vistry also identify ‘Climate Change’ as another strategic priority for the Plan. Specifically, new housing should be directed to locations that are or can be made sustainable, and which offer a genuine choice of sustainable transport modes (as per NPPF paragraphs 104 and 105). It is therefore vital that the Plan allocates land for residential development at locations with good access to high-frequency public transport services. Vistry argue that this should include Land South of Noble Tree Road, which adjoins Hildenborough Railway Station.

**OTHER (AGRICULTURE)** - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

**GREEN BELT** - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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 (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.



---

**User Response: Text**

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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 (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- 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 (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

OTHER (AGRICULTURE) - As evidenced by the shortages caused by the war in Ukraine, 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.

GREEN BELT - It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt land at all costs. The MGB around Tonbridge fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

## User Response: Text

- 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 (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Facilities in health and education have already deteriorated badly over many years and are under stress. Our roads are in bad condition and often congested.

Priorities must be and in this order:

2 GREEN BELT

1 CLIMATE CHANGE

3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Housing is not a strategic matter. It cannot feature amongst the more pressing and urgent issues of protecting our natural environment.

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

To protect the natural environment by over development. Sustain the historic nature of Hildenborough & Tonbridge from the thoughtless and careless attitude of under trained and unqualified developer.

The Green Belt is sacred and should be preserved at all costs.

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

**All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to *guide* your demand for housing. Housing is counter productive to 1/2/3/4/5/9 You are building housing that will mean vast areas being destroyed of green belt, natural environment thus contributing to climate change. On the back of that the amount of houses you are proposing across this area will put incredible amount on the infrastructure of this area. Hospitals are 20 mins drive away, doctors are already under pressure, secondary schools oversubscribed or having to travel far to get to, transport such as buses which are relied upon are being cut. The A25 is already under pressure and will add to the pollution of the area with more cars as the infrastructure like buses are being cut.**

Climate Change- To save the planet

Green Belt- Preserving its openness is critically important

AONB- Preserving the innate beauty of these areas is critically important. They must be preserved such that

---

### User Response: Text

urban and country dwellers can escape to beautiful areas for fresh air and exercise.

See above

Climate change as it is an emergency now. Community facilities and infrastructure very important for our daily living greenbelt preserving our environment

**Question 11** Three is not enough.

We chose:

- climate change as that has to be at the forefront of any new developments from now on
- the Green Belt as that is an established concept which should imply protection of the natural environment and historical character.
- housing as people should have access to affordable, decent homes.

### Other housing points

Affordable housing to rent and to buy should be a high priority

First time buyers should be high priority

People with special housing needs should have those needs met

More smaller properties

Control unrestricted urban sprawl. Resist encroaching in to the countryside. Regenerate derelict urban land.

The list of strategic matters listed is clearly comprehensive but the order of priority is debatable. Ng.

- We would argue, of the matters listed the priorities should be: Natural Environment, Tonbridge Town & Transport Infrastructure
- We do not agree that additional significant housing provision in the West Malling area is a priority Strategic Matter and questions the rationale for such housing increases proposed elsewhere across the Borough
- Analysis undertaken for BAG determined that in recent times, **it is estimated that the area within 1 mile of West Malling has absorbed 58% of new home building**
- **The West Malling area represents just 1% of the 24013 hectares of Tonbridge & Malling Borough.**
- The town is now in danger of being choked [e.g.by](#) traffic and lack of parking and infrastructure.
- TMBC's estimated population in 2020 was 132,600 across 56,096 dwellings

---

### User Response: Text

- The Government assessed housing need imposes a 30% increase to the number of dwellings which is not justified by TMBC's own housing need
- **This assessed housing need must have been based on significant migration into the Borough e.g. from London**
  - Far from addressing the affordability crisis for TMBC residents it will make it worse as such a great uplift could only be met through the development of large sites which attract buyers from London and SE London who can realise more value for money within Tonbridge and Malling.
  - The housing within local communities should be for people already based in those communities, such as those new developments in areas such as Plaxtol.
  - As communities across the Borough will confirm, the addition of recent new major developments has already put critical pressure on local infrastructure and services

Housing is not a strategic matter. It is the objective of the Local Plan. These strategies are to guide to TMBC's demand for housing.

We endorse that the consultation document recognises at paragraph 5.3.16 that addressing housing affordability should be identified as a key priority. As set out in our responses above, it should be recognised that this can only be addressed through the emerging Plan by going beyond the "minimum" housing requirements established by the standard method.

A significant constraint to meeting housing need is that 71% of the Borough is designated Green Belt land. This represents a significant constraint to development within some of the most sustainable parts of the Borough, and there will inevitably be a need for a Green Belt review to be completed and Green Belt release to be completed.

We acknowledge that to be able to support the delivery of the much-needed housing there needs to be adequate and sufficient community facilities to meet the needs of a growing and aging population. The Plan should acknowledge and support the way in which the provision of more homes can help deliver or fund via S106 contributions the expansion or delivery of new services and infrastructure. Moreover, how building homes generates a local population that increase spend in local existing community facilities, services and conveniences, supporting them to remain for the long term.

However, the order of priority is debatable and, with the existing settlements within West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill being BAG's focus, we would argue the 3 most important strategic matters are:

- Natural Environment
- Tonbridge Town
- Transport infrastructure

In brief, and with regard to the other priorities, BAG does not agree that additional significant housing provision in the West Malling area is a priority Strategic Matter, in fact our analysis would encourage TMBC officers to re-

---

**User Response: Text**

examine and question the rationale for the level of housing increases proposed across the rest of the Borough too.

As mentioned previously, analysis undertaken for BAG determined that in recent times, it is estimated that the area within 1 mile of West Malling has absorbed 58% of new home building. This area represents just 1% of the 24,013 hectares of Tonbridge & Malling Borough. There is no doubt that this has led to the relative affluence of the town but it is now in danger of being choked e.g. by traffic and lack of parking and infrastructure.

The estimated population for Tonbridge and Malling, stated in the Reg 18 Consultation document, was 132,600 in 2020 utilising some 56,000 dwellings. The housing allocation suggested by central Government for the period of the new local plan is 15,941 which is an increase of around 30%. Organic population growth is nowhere near this figure and, whilst acknowledging there may be a continued trend away from the traditional 'nuclear family', an increase in need for housing stock of one third over such a relatively short period could only be realised from migration into the area, especially from more expensive areas such as the London metropolis. Far from addressing the acute affordability crisis (as detailed in the Stage 2 Green Belt Study) faced by some local people, such large-scale increases in housing stock are only achieved through major developers building new housing in large sites which attract new families to the area who can realise more value for their money within Tonbridge and Malling.

As communities across the Borough will confirm, the addition of recent new major developments has already put critical pressure on local infrastructure and services.

All developments should be sustainable and supported by appropriate infrastructure & transport. It is important that the land is susceptible to the effects of climate change.

Additional infrastructure is required to relieve the already over stretched facilities.

The Green Belt is very important, preferable extended to the West Malling by-pass otherwise everywhere becomes anonymous,

Any increase in housing should also be accompanied by improvements in infrastructure before the build. Not after as current as it does not happen. Public transport is also required.

You cannot develop without considering transport AND the private car. If your transport is inadequate then you WILL have two cars per household and cars parked on the kerb! It is sheer foolishness to think otherwise.

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing.

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to *guide*

---

## User Response: Text

your demand for housing

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for HOUSING MIX

Other agriculture, shortage of own grown produce will be made worse by building on agricultural land.

The list of strategic matters listed is clearly comprehensive but the order of priority is debatable. Ng.

- We would argue, of the matters listed the priorities should be: Natural Environment, Tonbridge Town & Transport Infrastructure
  - We do not agree that additional significant housing provision in the West Malling area is a priority Strategic Matter and questions the rationale for such housing increases proposed elsewhere across the Borough
  - Analysis undertaken for BAG determined that in recent times, **it is estimated that the area within 1 mile of West Malling has absorbed 58% of new home building**
  - **The West Malling area represents just 1% of the 24013 hectares of Tonbridge & Malling Borough.**
  - The town is now in danger of being choked [e.g.by](#) traffic and lack of parking and infrastructure.
  - TMBC's estimated population in 2020 was 132,600 across 56,096 dwellings
- The Government assessed housing need imposes a 30% increase to the number of dwellings which is not justified by TMBC's own housing need
- **This assessed housing need must have been based on significant migration into the Borough e.g. from London**
- Far from addressing the affordability crisis for TMBC residents it will make it worse as such a great uplift could only be met through the development of large sites which attract buyers from London and SE London who can realise more value for money within Tonbridge and Malling.
  - The housing within local communities should be for people already based in those communities, such as those new developments in areas such as Plaxtol.
  - As communities across the Borough will confirm, the addition of recent new major developments has already put critical pressure on local infrastructure and services

Priorities must be:

1. Green Belt.
2. Climate Change.
3. Natural Environment.

Housing is not a strategic matter. It cannot feature amongst the more pressing and urgent issues of protecting our natural environment, which has lasting benefits for all people, as well as wildlife.

Maintaining a balance between what we have and what we need.

---

## User Response: Text

Further to our comments above (in Q.2), we support the preservation of the Green Belt, given that 15,000+ acres of green space in Kent is about to be lost to development. In particular, we advocate retaining effective Green Belt buffers between rural hamlets and urban areas, with an absolute minimum of 500m (as TMBC previously set-out<sup>1</sup>). The Green Belt is vital in helping to preserve the separate identity and rural setting, of such settlements/the surrounding countryside. Thus, we advocate policies being adopted to ensure important Green Belt buffers be retained. As such, we do not support options that would result in the release of Green Belt land, especially in south-west Tonbridge, where it will effectively remove this buffer; with the urban confines coming within 200m of Lower Haysden (e.g. if Sites 59764 & 59641 taken forward). TMBC<sup>1</sup> have stated: “little ... is achieved by major further outward suburban expansion that ... adds to traffic problems”. With reference to the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, many of the Objectives (namely: to improve human health & well-being and to improve levels of education attainment) cannot be supported or realised without adequate local community facilities, which are currently under pressure from the existing demand, especially in Tonbridge. For instance, we live in south-west Tonbridge, where there is currently a lack of local primary school places. Without the inclusion of such needed facilities, it will put more pressure on existing services and will result in people having to travel further (e.g. take school children to the other side of Tonbridge), which is likely to promote private car usage, rather than active travel, and increase the town’s congestion issues. Furthermore, given the existing highway capacity issues in Tonbridge, as acknowledged by TMBC (above & Q.4), with many of the town’s junctions operating above practical capacity (i.e. 95%) and the lack of e.g. primary school places; any development policies for the town must take account of these issues, in order to achieve sustainable development. Our concerns in particular, about the lack of highway capacity, in south-west Tonbridge where this is acute, are detailed in Q.8. Thus, we advocate a strategy that adopts an ‘infrastructure first’ approach (inc. providing adequate community facilities and transport capacity), to ensure that the required infrastructure is delivered to support the sustainable development that our communities need. It might also be prudent to adopt strategic policies that looks to focus development away from areas with severe capacity issues and where there are no adequate/robust measures to mitigate such harm. Note local cycleway improvements would not address private car usage, if there is a lack of local school places.

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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

---

### User Response: Text

(e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

**All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing. Housing is counter productive to 1/2/3/4/5/9 You are building housing that will mean vast areas being destroyed of green belt, natural environment thus contributing to climate change. On the back of that the amount of houses you are proposing across this area will put incredible amounts of strain on the local infrastructure of this area. Hospitals are 20 mins drive away, doctors are already under pressure, secondary schools oversubscribed or having to travel far to get to, transport such as buses which are relied upon are being cut. The A25 is already under pressure and will add to the pollution of the area with more cars as the infrastructure like buses are being cut.**

CLIMATE CHANGE - The multitude of risks associated with climate change including: changing seasons (which reduces crop production and biodiversity), frequent flooding, drought and loss of rain water for reservoirs etc. is therefore an urgent issue that any plan must address to mitigate e.g. by preserving carbon capturing green spaces.

GREENBELT - preservation supports the point above but also important for the wellbeing of the human, animal and plant population in the area. It is also important for the local economy as visitors enjoy these spaces.

It is vital to protect Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) around Tonbridge that fulfils all the requirements laid down in the NPPF:

- (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.

TRANSPORT – Tonbridge is constrained by an ancient road network designed for pedestrians and horses. It struggles to cope with current demand and additional capacity cannot be delivered on many routes if any. Any



## User Response: Text

new development at all will require junction modifications in the Shipbourne Road/ London Road area. It has proven impossible to bring forward improvements to South Tonbridge and in fact the reconfiguration of the junction at Waterloo Road/Quarry Hill Road has actually made the situation worse.

One of the greatest issues we can do to tackle climate change is to create 15 minute communities to minimise the need to drive and to do that we need to place active travel at the heart of all new developments across the borough. There is no point in asking for developer contributions to pay for additional bus capacity unless that is on an ongoing basis. time-limited payments will only leave communities without a service in future as we have seen with the X1 and X2 buses in Kings Hill recently.

The list of strategic matters listed is clearly comprehensive but the order of priority is debatable. Ng.

- We would argue, of the matters listed the priorities should be: Natural Environment, Tonbridge Town & Transport Infrastructure
  - We do not agree that additional significant housing provision in the West Malling area is a priority Strategic Matter and questions the rationale for such housing increases proposed elsewhere across the Borough
  - Analysis undertaken for BAG determined that in recent times, **it is estimated that the area within 1 mile of West Malling has absorbed 58% of new home building**
  - **The West Malling area represents just 1% of the 24013 hectares of Tonbridge & Malling Borough.**
  - The town is now in danger of being choked [e.g.by](#) traffic and lack of parking and infrastructure.
  - TMBC's estimated population in 2020 was 132,600 across 56,096 dwellings
- The Government assessed housing need imposes a 30% increase to the number of dwellings which is not justified by TMBC's own housing need
- **This assessed housing need must have been based on significant migration into the Borough e.g. from London**
- Far from addressing the affordability crisis for TMBC residents it will make it worse as such a great uplift could only be met through the development of large sites which attract buyers from London and SE London who can realise more value for money within Tonbridge and Malling.
  - The housing within local communities should be for people already based in those communities, such as those new developments in areas such as Plaxtol.
  - As communities across the Borough will confirm, the addition of recent new major developments has already put critical pressure on local infrastructure and services

The current facilities and infrastructure already cannot cope with current residents. People who live in Tonbridge and Malling live here because it is a rural area. More development will change this.

agricultural - we need to retain valuable farm land for food production

Green Belt - we must protect MGB for climate change and quality of peoples lives/mental health

develop brown sites, avoid urban sprawl, support biodiversity

---

**User Response: Text**

CFI - GP's, schools, state of roads all under stress and lack of funding

Maintaining a balance between what we have and what we need.

They are fundamental to life in 21st century England

6 (Transport) - As mentioned earlier, the road through the village should not be used for huge lorries and trucks, my house literally shakes all day and night. Money should be spent on a diversion not unnecessary housing.

2 & 1 (Green Belt and Climate Change) are intrinsically linked- Green belt land is vital for the health and well being of the environment and for the people.

Providing accommodation for all. There seems to be a chronic shortage of housing suitable for an ageing population, and also for those looking to start out on the housing ladder. Not all young people/families want to life in a flat in the middle of Tonbridge.

See above.

All are important but 6 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

The war in Ukraine has made it very clear how important it is to produce as much food as we can in the UK: Green Belt land is essential to protect especially as we are an island. It is what England is all about - is good for well-being. Infrastructure is already overwhelmed, and to add to the obvious like health, education - water is now equally important - specially with climate change. More house to supply and in an area where drought is on the up. It must be used for Agriculture.

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to *guide* your demand for housing

**User Response: Text**

**All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to *guide* your demand for housing**

Priorities should be and in this order:

#2 Green Belt

#6 Transport

#5 Community facilities and infrastructure

Housing is not a strategic matter. It is the objective of the Local Plan. These strategies are to guide TMBC's demand for housing.

Priorities should be and in this order:

#2 Green Belt

#6 Transport

#5 Community facilities and infrastructure

Housing is not a strategic matter. It is the objective of the Local Plan. These strategies are to guide TMBC's demand for housing.

All are important but housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan. The strategies are to guide your demand for housing.

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is a sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

To reduce climate change we should not be building on green field sites

**All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to *guide* your demand for housing**

---

**User Response: Text**

I disagree that housing (option 8) is of equal importance to the others.

Priorities must be and in this order:

2 GREEN BELT

1 CLIMATE CHANGE

3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Housing is not a strategic matter. It cannot feature amongst the more pressing and urgent issues of protecting our natural environment.

All 3 are vital to give the population of Tonbridge a good standard of life

These should be the priorities based upon retaining the landscape and character of the borough

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

All are important But 8 Housing is not strategic, it is the sole function of the plan - these strategies are to guide your demand for housing

Climate change and Natural environment because these should be the number 1 priorities for every country on this planet.

Green Belt, for the very reason it was introduced, which is even more pressing now than when it was introduced.

All of them are important but housing is not a strategic matter. The rest are to guide your plan for housing.

Maintaining a balance between what we have and what we need.

The list of strategic matters listed is clearly comprehensive and would be difficult to argue against. However, the order of priority is debatable and, with the existing settlements within West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill being BAG's focus, we would argue the 3 most important strategic matters are:

- Natural Environment
- Tonbridge Town
- Transport infrastructure

In brief, and with regard to the other priorities, BAG does not agree that additional significant housing provision in the West Malling area is a priority Strategic Matter, in fact our analysis would encourage TMBC officers to re-examine and question the rationale for the level of housing increases proposed across the rest of the Borough too.

---

**User Response: Text**

As mentioned previously, analysis undertaken for BAG determined that in recent times, it is estimated that the area within 1 mile of West Malling has absorbed 58% of new home building. This area represents just 1% of the 24,013 hectares of Tonbridge & Malling Borough. There is no doubt that this has led to the relative affluence of the town but it is now in danger of being choked e.g. by traffic and lack of parking and infrastructure.

The estimated population for Tonbridge and Malling, stated in the Reg 18 Consultation document, was 132,600 in 2020 utilising some 56,000 dwellings. The housing allocation suggested by central Government for the period of the new local plan is 15,941 which is an increase of around 30%. Organic population growth is nowhere near this figure and, whilst acknowledging there may be a continued trend away from the traditional 'nuclear family', an increase in need for housing stock of one third over such a relatively short period could only be realised from migration into the area, especially from more expensive areas such as the London metropolis. Far from addressing the acute affordability crisis (as detailed in the Stage 2 Green Belt Study) faced by some local people, such large-scale increases in housing stock are only achieved through major developers building new housing in large sites which attract new families to the area who can realise more value for their money within Tonbridge and Malling.

As communities across the Borough will confirm, the addition of recent new major developments has already put critical pressure on local infrastructure and services.

Agriculture: - We need to grow more food with an increasing population & not import so much of our food.

Green Belt: - It is vital to protect the MGB. The Green belt round Tonbridge meets all the requirements laid down in the NPPF.

Community facilities etc.: Health & education have deteriorated in the last few years & the traffic has increased on all roads in the area.

These are all vital to keeping local rural areas safe and having no development that changes the local area.

Answer:

Climate Change- To save the planet

Green Belt- Preserving its openness is critically important

AONB- Preserving the innate beauty of these areas is critically important. They must be preserved such that urban and country dwellers can escape to beautiful areas for fresh air and exercise.

Housing is not a strategic matter. It is the objective of the Local Plan. These strategies are to guide to TMBC's demand for housing.

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:11:42. Total records: 717

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 19] What are your reasons for selecting these particular...

### User Response: Text

I have an adult son who is working full time with no chance of renting or owning his own home he is 25 years old. I have direct employment related experience of the shortages of staff in health and social care and affordability of housing is an issue in attracting people to work in the care industry. I have personal experience of the impacts of too much development impacting on the availability of emergency services including GP appointments hospital waiting times lack of dental care and most recently getting a vet appointment. I have experienced gridlocked choked up roads . I have seen more people living on the streets no place to live and I have seen the impact on local communities crime and deterioration in behaviour and respect due to lack of family and youth support and the destruction of communities

Because there is a shortage of properties at the bottom end of the scale which clogs up the housing supply chain. If we are to retain skilled workers in the area then we need to support young people trying to get on the housing ladder.

Future developments should be small in scale and aimed at either first time buyers and/or those downsizing which will naturally release larger housing onto the market for those moving up.

The piecemeal development that seems to be carried out now is damaging to our villages and to the open spaces around us.

There should be more provision of homes to rent by low paid workers, close to places of work or good public transport.

I don't believe we should be developing on anything other than brownfield sites

Size of developments should be small to create sense of community. Environmentally friendly building material should be used ie not concrete. Renewable energy should be required for each property eg heat pumps.

Cost of houses is now way out of line with salaries. At time of writing, interest rates and inflation are soaring. House price crash is more or less inevitable. So many more homes are needed to rent as homes get repossessed

More affordable housing and first time buyer housing is essential, as well as meeting the right type of accommodation needs through clear unit size policies. New housing must be well designed first and foremost and densities should not be so high as to result in poorly planned schemes.

MMC is important so that houses are well-insulated and sustainable.

Housing needs to be distributed appropriately.

People with disabilities and care needs should be considered.

There needs to be a variety of types of housing to cater for the different categories of resident.

If you have to build more houses, then they should at least try and make the world a better place.

So MMC to reduce environment impact, reduce the density for people's wellbeing and to be in-keeping with the local area, improve the local facilities, provide for people's needs in ways the existing stock doesn't always.

Because they are most important to me personally

---

**User Response: Text**

We need housing for local people who can find schools, doctors' surgeries, work all within the local area.

Prevention of it an sprawl and not just homes for rich people . Facilities important as these so often are not provided for years

As outlined above the houses being built now are not conducive to a happy community because the high density causes neighbourhood disputes and animosity. And the infrastructure is seriously lacking with regard to schools, doctors, hospitals, dentists, emergency service access and support of vulnerable members (the elderly and those with poor health). We need to consider how the current density and infrastructure affects the quality of life for those living in the community. And will decreasing green spaces it is becoming worse as people do not have any quality of life.

I am disabled and have not found housing to meet my needs but realise that most households require affordable housing that must also have the infrastructure to meet their requirements.

We need a range of provision, especially for young adults

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings. Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions. Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses - and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high Type of housing (Tat/house) Other – please state below standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge. Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to



---

**User Response: Text**

mitigate climate change.

We only have one planet!

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved.

Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

There is a need for affordable housing to buy. There is an excessive reliance on private rental properties which has caused house price inflation due to would-be buyers being "outbid" by private landlords.

Density of developments will need careful management. An urban density should not be incorporated into large new developments. Each plot should have adequate percentage of its footprint of open space around it.

Distribution of housing should be dependent on where there is sufficient infrastructure already in place to support the additional demand.

The use of MMC should be encouraged to provide better quality, sustainable and environmentally efficient buildings. The design of such building will need to be aesthetically pleasing, however.

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)**- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

**Density of Housing** – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing** – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first** - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing

---

**User Response: Text**

infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Rampant over development is blighting the community, there is not enough infrastructure to cope. Traffic is awful. Please please build on brownfield first and ensure there is a proper infrastructure

I think they reflect our need, but the infrastructure must be in place

To minimise impact on the TMBC area as a whole and in particular East Malling

Housing needs to be a sustainable investment retained by the Borough and not flipped for quick and easy profits that then price most out of the housing stock

Leave the area as it is

I think they cover the main needs of the community. We need variety, infrastructure and to support the needs of the most vulnerable as well as green spaces. Nearly all of these are met in the Barden area of Tonbridge and it is consequently a happy and pleasant area in which to live.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Affordable Housing to buy promotes the housing market enabling people to move up the housing ladder in response to changing needs.

Affordable Housing to rent to assist students and transient workers.

Infrastructure (schools, roads, healthcare, open space etc) supporting new homes delivered in a timely fashion Essential for communities and promoting identity.

Specialist housing for people with particular care needs Especially the elderly

Building more houses than the infrastructure, facilities and services of communities can accommodate is a major concern for existing communities.

Need small sites so as not to affect the local infrastructure

These are the issues that are most strongly brought to my attention by local people I meet

---

**User Response: Text**

I've based my choices on spreading the positive and negative impacts of development across the area and creating diverse communities and meeting diverse needs, all the while trying to maximise quality (infrastructure, environment, etc)

Affordable housing so people can stay in the area

The need for cheaper housing and more infrastructure is paramount.

I believe many of these options are important but I have selected what I consider are the major ones.

In all things there needs to be a balance. Up market, mid market, low market. Building types. Tenures etc etc.

MMC is the building of the future reducing prices, improving insulation values and increasing quality.

As I indicated earlier infrastructure is key to creating good local communities. if it is not there people will move to where it is,

When considering housing density we ought to consider making cellars mandatory in new build. This is done very effectively in Germany where much valuable living space is provided at no extra cost in land take. Car parking can be placed below the house or block of flats with utility rooms, drying rooms, storage space for things like bicycles heating and heating controls. There is also an insulating storey between the main living space and the ground.

We need no more 'executive developments', we need affordable housing. That housing needs to be environmentally first class with real attention to the environmental health of people and restoration of nature.

Because I don't agree with being forced to meet a planning target when we need other areas invested in , Roads , schools, hospitals to cope with what we already have living in the borough

MMC to reduce environment impact, reduce the density for people's wellbeing and to be in-keeping with the local area, improve the local facilities, provide for people's needs in ways the existing stock doesn't always.

Because new homes must be efficiently provided in the right places according to need, socially sustainable providing for resilient mental health (Skinner's experiments on rats still hold) allowing for flexible distance-independent working and sustainable in energy terms.

To create a welcoming and sustainable place for all people

Young people are a key priority to develop a proper family life. Housing should be energy efficient, and we should recognise that our population is aging and will need different housing.

---

**User Response: Text**

I have answered most of these in previous questions but housing for people with additional needs would be welcomed by me.

We have plenty of housing which is unaffordable to most, and therefore more affordable options should be a priority

flexibility and diversity of community

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Small sites of extra housing to sustainably increase housing stock village by village etc, not by dumping a mega-site in one place

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

See q's 10, 16 and 18

Quality of life for existing and new residents.

Availability of good quality new build properties at a reasonable price is rare in our bit of Kent. Rental and to buy.

This goes hand in hand with the expanding of other services to support these new residential areas.

Ensuring that we have more stock will address some of the supply/demand issues.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

These five chosen reasons are the most important to me.

Size of housing site/distribution across the borough: no development should be of such a size that it totally changes the environment in which it is built. No site should take the whole amount of housing need for the borough as in the Borough Green Garden proposal; housing should be shared out fairly and proportionately across the Borough where green belt and AONB are not compromised.

Infrastructure: see previous comments.

Affordable housing: all very well for people who initially buy the property but what happens when buyers sell on, suddenly they want to get as much money as possible and affordability then goes out the window!

Minimising impact and selecting sites where housing is needed without the expectation that occupiers will be required to travel in pursuit of their daily activities

As per previous answers – the balance of housing, sustainability and the need for community-based infrastructure is vital to the long term well being of the people in the area.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

Affordable, well designed estates with integrated local amenities and services, with large green spaces are of great importance to me.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Promote existing communities when developing or integrating new communities, a variation of homes to suit people's needs. To balance NPPF Objectives.

I chose affordability to rent and buy because homes are so costly here. Chose tenure because we need affordable secure homes to rent - not everybody is in a position to buy. I chose density because I think we have limited land available and so we need homes to be dense eg terraced houses or flats. (These also tend to be more affordable). I chose infrastructure because it is important to live in communities where people are able to walk or cycle to schools, shops, work, station, libraries, parks etc. This is healthier and allows neighbours to greet and get to know each other as they pass in the street, which builds community. It is also better for air quality and climate change mitigation to decrease car dependency.

I appreciate we have to build new homes but we need to plan these in a way that does not further diminish our green, natural space and climate. Over populating without appropriate health, education and transport infrastructure is also unacceptable and will not deliver against the plans strategic priorities

I think it is very important to ensure a supply of lower cost properties suitable for first time buyers, wherever possible. I am opposed to large, dense developments, because of the impact these have on local roads and service infrastructure. Unless housing developments are supported through investment in critical infrastructure, including roads, water supply and drainage, and healthcare facilities then the quality of life for the new residents will be poor.

The Local Plan should as a priority deliver homes for all members of the community. In determining location, due regard should be made to the HMA assessment to ensure a distribution of houses in locations reflected in the Settlement hierarchy, particularly Tonbridge.

Priority should be given to locations with established infrastructure to promote sustainability, rather than dispersal throughout the Borough where facilities such as education, healthcare, public transport and leisure are limited.

In addressing the housing priorities, consideration should be given to medium and larger sites to ensure that there is a good mix of sizes and tenures to meet the needs of all residents.

Design quality should also be given priority to ensure that housing developments not only deliver the numbers of

---

**User Response: Text**

houses required, but also provide developments where residents are proud to live and call home.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

- 1) I have concentrated on targeting affordable home for 1st time buyers as referred to in my previous answers.
- 2) The density of our builds has increased rapidly over the last 25 years -- when building 20+ properties on a site, if there are no existing green recreation spaces within walking distance and we are providing tiny or no garden, the development must include recreational space.
- 3) The infrastructure has far too often been an "after-thought" creating situations where the only way to get to facilities is by car with schools, surgeries, shops & green spaces frequently more than 5 or 10 mins travel away. Two things are a must for enlarging existing communities or creating new communities: - local facilities & public transport.

No comment

All have some value to determining what any one particular development should look to achieve. However the site size and location should strongly influence which are reasonable considerations to be addressed more strongly in any given plan

We must have affordable housing in the borough. Sizes of houses must be small not 4/5 bedroomed. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the borough is creaking badly and must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant healthy environment.

These are what I see as the priorities.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5 bedrooms. Flats must also be included.

Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden

---

**User Response: Text**

communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

As above, it will be important to meet housing needs across the whole of the borough and this will include a mix of homes stated above.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough sizes of houses must be small not 4/5 bedroomed. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly and must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Large developments are not welcome and building on any green land should not be considered.

Larger developments are going to impose on this.

We must have affordable housing in a pleasant environment.

I think the council should use modern forms of construction to include things such as alternative energy supplies (heat pumps, solar panels etc)

Higher density is important to maximise use of brownfield. Garden communities within these spaces will make them more pleasant to live and self-build could be focused on green/eco homes.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

As large numbers of people in the borough are now home workers at least some of the time, the inadequacy of internet/broadband in many rural areas has been highlighted. Alongside this, more affordable housing is urgently needed with better public transport links so people can access employment opportunities without needing a car on the congested and polluted road networks across the borough.



---

**User Response: Text**

Housing should be built for local people ....not to attract others to move from where they already have houses.

The key will be the density of the new developments which will have to be 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.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must Home-working opportunities Infrastructure (schools, roads, healthcare, open space etc) supporting new homes delivered in a timely fashion Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) Self-build and custom housebuilding Size of housing (1-bedroom, 2-bedrooms, 3+ bedrooms) Size of housing sites Specialist housing for people with particular care needs Tenure of housing (market purchase/private rent/affordable rent) Travelling Showpeople accommodation Type of housing (flat/house) Other – please state below therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Affordability is key, Also, existing communities shouldn't be blighted by huge developments which aren't suitable due to infrastructure, amenities and the impact on their quality of life.

The need to consider the current development in an area, so as not to make it into a huge conurbation.

First-time buyers and homes to rent at an affordable price for local people.

To accommodate the local population and to address climate change

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

I feel we need affordable housing particularly for first time buyers, not necessarily larger houses for wealthier people. I also feel it absolutely critical that these are constructed with the highest environmental standards.

Strange question since you already mentioned !! *In question 18, can you please select five matters that are most important to you.*

we have people who want to stay in the village - first time buyers, aging people downsizing etc - but there is no housing stock for them. We dont need the big family homes that developers want to build.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

If housing is to be built it should be aimed at first time buyers, include gardens, not be large sites, and be 100% energy net zero

Diverse housing required to cover different personal circumstances. Suitable infrastructure is VITAL or whole plan becomes worthless.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

I live in Platt and suffer from increasing traffic congestion and derioration of utlity services in the area. This area is not suitable for large development of new homes.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Developments will increase use on current struggling infrastructures. These MUST be addressed and corrected first!  
We do not want this to be a second home city where properties lie dormant.

All of these matters are important, but the ones chosen are those which I consider must not be forgotten.

Affordability is a key factor but there needs to be a balance in the diversity of people that move to the borough. Maidstone is a good example of poor balance where London boroughs have been allowed to move high volumes of people out into Maidstone. People are now scared to go to the High Street.

Infrastructure in the borough is creaking badly. Must be improved or premises built where it is likely to lead to less demand on the road network.

garden communities would allow for new infrastructure to be built.

Hildenborough is a rural village and any development must blend into the village hence large housing developments are unacceptable

Infrastructure is vital. Need to consider younger people who may not wish to be forced outside the area by price.

---

**User Response: Text**

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers.

I believe it would give a fair opportunity for sustainable environmental development for future needs. More modern building methods must be deployed.

We must have affordable housing in the borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small not 4-5 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant ,healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable homes to rent and buy.

We should be encouraging attractive homes to buy at affordable prices. We should be developing in previously developed land and spread development fairly across Councils. We should not be allowing development in flats which are unsightly and large developments just to achieve housing targets. We need to have more people buy their homes, rather than rent so that they are in a better position for their retirement.

For society to exist and function properly without over populating.

Whilst generally left leaning, I truly think housing should still follow market dynamics to some degree. People cannot all live in large houses in the country side and close to amenities - it's impossible. Welfare support through increased benefits I feel would be more beneficial and giving people more choices than artificially deflating house prices for some groups over others as simply the influx of people will continue. This is not meant to be a "bus is full type of comment". We moved into town because of facilities. Obviously staying in Ightham would have been nice, but we can't expect same services. People need to make choices. So am expluding all those special deals for only certain people. Do other countries do this, I have never heard of it anywhere else, but then benefits are likely higher.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved.

Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Density and distribution of housing are key if we are to maintain our Green Belt and preserve our historic villages. Limited development should be supported by improvement to the infrastructure.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We need to have a laser like focus on climate and environmental considerations, even to the extent a sizeable development has its own renewable community energy supply.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Focussing on these matters should ensure that developments are of a diverse nature and reasonable in scale.

Hildenborough has to my mind already reached the reasonable limit for new developments.

Building homes for younger people, addressing climate change, smaller developments

It is undeniable that new housing is required and will go ahead, however if construction must go ahead it is important that high-density housing is avoided and housing is fairly distributed across the local authority. Single sites with lots of housing is not desirable.

Garden cities often overdevelop sites and run the risk of developers trying to pack too much housing onto a site to maximise profits. Estate developments seen in the 70s and 80s are a good example of how not to build, as houses are often packed in too tightly with small gardens, small public amenity, and small rooms making the areas less desirable. Maximum density rules are also crucial in avoiding over-development.

Self-building often leads to desirable homes which are well-constructed and desirable. This leads to better-

---

## User Response: Text

looking neighbourhoods and increases the desirability of the locale. Self-Build also allows people to have a greater stake and say in the area they live in.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can send the doctors, nurses and teachers to start them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high

standards of

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can send the doctors, nurses and teachers to start them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high

insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tunbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same

---

**User Response: Text**

applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding

high standards of insulation, energy self- sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

As above in question 18

Infrastructure is key

Affordable appropriately sized houses and flats not huge mansions

Infrastructure is key

Quality of life for residents

Quality of life for residents

I believe that these points have already been covered in previous comments related to infrastructure, environmental impact etc.

To ensure we have variety of modern housing to cater for all needs and people, and particularly affordable housing, delivered in the right locations, at the point in time when infrastructure investment can also facilitate and accommodate current and future, wider development.

Housing development should reflect the needs of the people in the different areas across the borough.

it whats best for TMBC and its people. the residents and the people we want to attrach to our area at the same time it assists supports and protects people in need which is better for TMBC as housing assicoations, builders, businesses will want to be here instead of a high urban poverty struck area.

---

**User Response: Text**

Affordable housing to rent (council owned) - includes flats and smaller hose sizes.

Density of housing: so that we can make efficeint use of town centre brownfield land and retain harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

sustainability/environmental builds and MMC - these can be fast to builw low cost, and have lower climate impact. Can include high standards of insulation energysel self sufficeincy. Regard for the MGB. Use brownfiled first.

well planned local infrastrucutre: including energy efficeincy and climate change (insulation etc), active transport .

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved.

Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Experience of the recent building prjects in the local are ahas not been satisfactory

We should require development that creates homes that all our population can afford. There are a lot of wealthy individuals in the South east and little is done for those who are denied opportunity due to affordability issues.

We are facing climate catastrophe, new houses have to be fit for purpose. We should live in a society where people are both able to buy and rent affordably.

Houses should be built for the requirements of local people and not for attracting people from other areas. Our children need affordable housing in the areas they grew up in.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Local people are not catered for by the building that is going on at the moment alot of the houses build go to people from outside the bought on a vast scale and are unaffordable for local people. Even the small number of houses that the developers let go for cheaper amounts go to boroughs outside ours.



---

**User Response: Text**

Spent more than 50% time working from home, need peace and quietness in home in order to work effectively

Small developments over large developments to avoid an infrastructure meltdown, more importantly for first time buyers in max. 3 bedroom properties, we do not need bigger houses which, with the population demographic of The borough, people will down-size and make this type of property available by natural wastage. Tonbridge is choking, look right across the borough where the need is greatest.

It is important to support first time buyers to enable them to get into the housing market with affordable houses to buy. For those who cannot achieve that, affordable houses to rent is also important. Infrastructure must be able to support all of this and smaller developments are preferable over larger ones.

To make housing available to those who can least afford it.

Its important that there is affordable housing for less well off families. Distribution of sites within the borough affects everyone whether they are looking for housing or not hence its a priority consideration. You can't go on building houses unless there is the commensurate increase in infrastructure. Size is important so as not to swamp existing build and historic environment as in the Capel.

I'm sure that it would be far easier to select a handful of the larger proposed sites, than it would to deal with the additional administration that selecting far more of the smaller sites would inevitably bring, and my concern is that there is a danger that this just becomes a box-ticking exercise, with TMBC pushing for whatever is most straightforward in terms of administration and delivery. But the reality is that a development of several thousand new homes in many areas of the borough would have a severe negative impact on quality of life for those already living there. A development of even 50 homes in one of the small rural settlements would have a considerable impact. To that end, I believe that any development which takes place outside of the areas that you have classed as 'urban areas' (in the existing settlement hierarchy) should be restricted to small sites only.

I think there should be distribution across the borough. There needs to be choice in terms of size, tenure, ways of providing a home like custom and self build. Density of housing is too much from my experience in Kings Hill of a village in a rural setting and infrastructure problems have proved critical. There is no station that serves the need of the community that does not require driving and parking at a station. Buses have either been withdrawn or are not co-ordinated with the train times. It is not feasible to cycle out from the Kent Road end. We cannot get into doctors appointments. There is no secondary school and children leave the village to go to about 32 secondary schools in the area. Both roads from the community rely on the A228 to be open and often the traffic is dense and it is difficult to get in or out. The infrastructure is creaking and cannot take much more. There is no parking overflow and now we have reached critical parking levels with double yellow lines proposed, the developer and ASDA placing private parking restrictions on previously free to use car parks. We can hardly park on the A228 when Kings Hill is full!

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6

---

**User Response: Text**

bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the borough. Sizes of houses built must concentrate on 2 and 3 bedroom, not 4, 5 and 6 bedroom properties.  
Flats need to be included.  
Borough infrastructure is already creaking badly and must be improved.  
Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created whilst providing healthy and pleasant environments for residents.

Housing delivery in general is a priority for the Borough. Affordability is an area of concern nationwide but even more so within the south-east and in particular Tonbridge and Malling where house prices are higher than the national average.

Affordable housing not 'Des Res's'

Housing costs in Tonbridge are high and therefore a plan should include affordable housing.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

The biggest issue will be for the next generation to get started on the housing ladder. The rest of the market will take care of itself.

If houses are going to be built in our beautiful and historic county high-density housing must be avoided. Dense housing is not desirable and puts too much pressure on road and other amenity. It is also unsightly and undesirable.

Larger housing plots should be designated to Self-builders as often the houses are pleasant to look at, well-constructed are what people actually want to live in. This leads to a better neighbourhood

---

**User Response: Text**

Garden cities often overdevelop sites with as houses that are often packed in too tightly with small gardens, small public amenity, and small rooms making the areas less desirable.

Maximum density rules should be in place to avoid over-development.

Infrastructure and public transport need to be addressed in a co-ordinated fashion within the whole area

The planet is on its knees - more houses means more people, it has to stop. But as everyone seems to be determined to build until the last inch has been built on we should at least be mitigating the impact.

We need to have a sustainable approach to building, especially in existing areas. They should not detract from the local feel of a place, in particular villages have a 'feel' about them' and if built/added to can lose their appeal. All developments need to consider the local infrastructure and services/amenities as in most places they are already stretched to breaking point and without investment local people will resent the developments. Having affordable housing for first time buyers is important to ensure that small villages and towns encourage the younger generation to stay around and they can afford to get on the housing ladder, otherwise the local working age population will get older and reduce the feel of a village/town.

Need to retain space to maintain mental health, especially for those working from home. Additional bedrooms provide flexibility in terms of working and living. Ability to stay in property rather than move. Infrastructure is key. Physical premises required, but also the ability to staff these long term.

The explosion of population in and around existing populations will result in unsustainable demand on the capacity of the local services that is already struggling. Previous developer promises to provide capacity have not been fulfilled. We cannot believe them without contractual and financial commitments. Previous and existing developers have compressed site occupation. Poor design and reduced internal space in dwellings result in atrocious conditions. Plus many of these sites are green areas and are essential to the character and beauty of the whole area. To build like this would be a planning disaster as it would deny the original concepts and the reasons why existing residents chose to move here. Surely professional planners in our council can see this.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and

---

**User Response: Text**

to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Huge opportunities were missed when building Peters Village and Wouldham School for the installation of renewables. The cost now to retro-fit these properties will now have to be found through TMBC budgets or funding rather than the developer.

We need to build attractive, small (-->density) units with eco-friendly design features to help transform the housing market from a non-sustainable, sprawling model to a sustainable, dense housing offer. The model should maximise shared outdoor space including food growing and recreational spaces, maximise public transport and cycle path access, and minimise private car parking areas. This is the way to nudge people into planet-friendly behaviours, and it is working in continental Europe.

We cannot continue to plan and build the same way again and again and again!

No mention of flatted houses in local towns in this

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment

those selected seem to me to be the most important

See comments on question 18

The plan incorporates large areas of dense housing, in places where the countryside will be destroyed, and thus people who enjoy the beauty of these places will be denied that which they have previously enjoyed. The total number of houses stated to be required in the local plan is totally unrealistically high.

I want to see smaller developments with mixed accommodation. Please do not destroy local communities by going for the large sites.

---

**User Response: Text**

I realise that may be the easy option but it will never be the right option.

We all need to accept some development in our areas, but not excessive.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Homes for younger people, smaller developments, addressing climate change

These are tough choices but I have tried to support affordable housing using sustainable buildings with a measured scale of development and adequate infrastructure.

We need affordable housing and the infrastructure improved. Garden communities would be ideal and provide a pleasant, healthy environment.

All to do with the present infrastructure and the effects on the environment

Diversity is what is required - it gives residents an opportunity to upscale/downsize depending on requirements.

I believe the area is already highly populated by comparison to many others, its local farmland needs to be protected and encouraged to help support a drive to countrywide food self sufficiency. Locally sourced food should be a goal for the council as it should be fresher, 'greener' and supports the local community. The quality of life for many people in the area can be measured by the environment they live and work in. Over populated areas usually score very badly on this with higher medical illness issues, which in turn leads to greater

---

**User Response: Text**

local costs.

The area has a great history of farming, access to these green sites and even just driving down the county lanes is a precious joy that would be sad to lose.

Eco friendly, affordable and with 'some space'---these are my top priorities.

Accessibility, Equality and inclusion matters.

People need support services as well as shops, schools, places of worship, sport facilities and green spaces

Community works best when mixed together.

Affordable Housing to Rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

I think care is needed to make sure any housing provided is directed toward those who need it and does not change life for those who already live in the area. I dont think it should be a way to provide work for house builders and to bolster the economy.

---

**User Response: Text**

Kings Hill, for example, is squashed together, with houses overlooking each other and tiny gardens. This is an example of houses not being adequately spaced and cost being prioritised over road width, provision of driveways for more than 1 car etc.

Space and views of something other than the inside of someone else's house are the vital difference between living in a town and living in the countryside. Space and not feeling like you are on top of people is important, both to buyers and those already in the villages and areas where building is proposed.

Life Time homes for all sectors and green efficient low cost energy built into all. Recycling but be easy .

Use minimum land for supplying homes to a larger number of people who currently struggle to rent or buy affordable homes and are either from the area and/or work in the area.

We must have affordable housing in the borough. Size of houses built must have a limited number of bedrooms, not a 4, 5, 6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the borough is barely adequate at present and would need to be improved. Garden Communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be improved and facilities to be created to provide a pleasant, healthy environment.

Need to make local housing attainable for people in different income bands, also need to have infrastructure improved to support increased population and traffic volumes resulting from new developments.

Important matters that affect us all.

No Response

Provide housing to meet essential need of the borough .... not 4+ bedroom properties out of reach for the local community and those lower on the housing ladder

Small houses so they are affordable.,not 4,5,6 bedrooms.

The enviroment and sustainability

All the items in the list should be catered for to ensure they are available to address the needs for the proportion of people in the area.

---

## User Response: Text

Density is a priority, in order to make the best use of the sites currently available, but more importantly to place the new housing within existing settlement boundaries, before any new green field sites are considered, The negative aspects of Green field sites, carbon footprint, loss of rural character, loss of Agricultural and ecological value, increase demand for traffic and services infrastructure, have to outweigh the immediate amenity concerns of neighbours, which often prevent infill development in sustainable residential areas. The low density of much mid C20 housing estates prevents best use of land within urban environments and planning policy should encourage, not deter new small infill developments or the subdivision of existing properties to create more homes. It should not remain easier to get approval for new estates of houses on green field sites, than to increase the density of development within established built up areas. Changing work and retail practices means that central areas need more relaxed zoning plans to encourage new residential development in redundant commercial properties, in order to revitalise these areas. The centre of Tonbridge is a case in point, where the area immediately around the station and High Street is given over to parking or storage yards, in the most sustainable area of the borough for high density housing.

Distribution is important because it needs to be in sustainable locations that minimise adverse impacts on other parts of the borough. If new development is spread evenly across the borough the adverse impacts will be much greater as a result of additional traffic being forced onto the already congested roads, to travel to services and transport hubs. Focussing the new houses in proximity to these hubs will result in fewer movements, to everyone's benefits. This means abandoning a distribution of new housing based purely on the size of each settlement and adopting a plan which locates the majority of housing close to existing transport hubs. This may mean locations previously undeveloped such as at West Malling Station and Hildenborough Station become centres for new housing, but it makes better use of the limited rail connections in the borough and helps keep cars off the roads. These health and congestion benefits for the whole borough outweigh particular local and Green belt issues.

Infrastructure is key as a 29% uplift in the number of households demands an equivalent uplift in infrastructure and services in order to ensure the living standards for new and existing residents are maintained. Currently there are shortages across the Borough of trained doctors, dentists, teachers and technicians, as well as water, power and data resources. Unless the required upgrades are funded and the new buildings, networks, generating capacity, water storage, carbon capture and trained people are provided then the houses that are delivered by this new plan will just lead to a major reduction in the quality of life for residents. New development should only be supported where the new support services and infrastructure are underwritten and in place. Otherwise implementation of the plan would be reckless and negligent.

Size of sites is key. Currently larger, greenfield sites have proportionately fewer planning restrictions and costs than small integrated infill developments, so are favoured for the delivery of the majority of the housing demanded in the local plan. This results in large tracts of faceless suburbia, eating into our rural areas and eroding the character and separation of our towns and villages. We must weight the planning controls and site selection to encourage small infill developments, ideally within established settlements. Large greenfield developments do not support the local economy. Consultants and contractors come from outside the borough and the product is not specific to the area or conditions. Small infill developments are usually by local contractors, with local consultants and employees, so the money gets reinvested in the area and the developers care about the product as it is where they live.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.



---

### User Response: Text

AS noted above, affordable housing is critically needed both for sale and rent (from the council NOT private landlords).

And while I'm at it the Council should take a stand on second home ownership which I'm pretty sure absorbs some of the housing supply in the borough. Also foreign investors buying off plan. This is a big problem in London and I'm sure it has shifted down here.

Infrastructure provision is essential. It is obvious nonsense to build housing without adequate transport links. Rapid development in Tonbridge has already imposed severe strains on the transport infrastructure and the particular constraints imposed by geography on the road network must be confronted and a plan drawn up to tackle the traffic problem. Otherwise the already very poor air quality in the High Street will become lethal. There are also already heavy strains on medical services in Tonbridge and elsewhere in the borough. The Council needs a plan for tackling this issue .

We need a study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which wastewater treatment works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building.

Modern construction methods must be investigated, and if necessary imposed, in the interests both of tackling climate change and low cost house building.

You have already taken large green spaces for sites. You need to use existing brownfield sites like the Park and Ride car parks which have been closed down

Small only housing sites.

Housing is a priority for local people, it is **not** a priority to attract incomers to an already overcrowded area.

A mix of housing to buy and rent, and infrastructure to suit increased development and population, restricting high density, height and mass - to respect surrounding buildings and environment generally, is crucial to leave open space.

Isn't this whole endeavour about lack of available housing both to buy and to rent? It should be affordable on both counts and distributed where most needed across the borough. Infrastructure is key to a successful development and to add to those essentials we are believers that gardens and green spaces are paramount for well being

TO house the local population, zero emissions to help climate change

The aim of this consultation is to provide safe affordable housing. I think it is important houses are not packed together, safe from flooding with good transport links, with an ageing population accessible and perhaps looking

---

**User Response: Text**

to build small groups of bungalows in some villages with basic amenities is also important, as 24% of the uk population will be over 65.

Building homes for younger people. Addressing climate change. Smaller developments

No response

Living in a rural community is very important to me, and I would therefore be against large housing developments. However I am acutely aware that the kind of rural living I am fortunate enough to enjoy means that many young people and families simply cannot afford to buy or rent in this area. Schools and healthcare facilities are stretched beyond capacity currently, and surrounding roads are already too busy.

Secure rented accommodation - that is actually affordable to local people - should be a priority.

Density should be optimised to reduce greenfield land take.

Infrastructure should be provided to support new homes – but new homes should not be built to support (unsustainable) new road building. As set out in our response to Question 11, it has been demonstrated in CPRE research that road-building is failing to provide the congestion relief and economic boost promised, while devastating the environment - <https://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/the-end-of-the-road-challenging-the-road-building-consensus/> .

local needs as above

it is important to develop large sites associated with existing urban areas such as Kings Hill, Medway Gap, Walderslade, Snodland and Tonbridge where the requisite infrastructure and amenities can be provided and existing shops and services are readily accessible without placing undue pressure on public transport and the road networks

They all feed into the local infrastructure - density/number of houses/size of housing. Building 16k 1 bedroom flats is wildly different from building 16k 4-5 bedroom detached homes

If we are to build homes in an area where there is already a shortage of doctors, this will just make the situation worse. Just last year more houses were built on Kings Hill and I understand more are planned. Our Doctors have not increased in number, in fact their consulting hours have been reduced. They have no way of coping with more patients. Also, the roads where some of the planned sites are proposed are single lane roads. They would never be able to cope with hundreds of cars leaving each morning (some of the sites are nowhere near a train or bus!)

---

**User Response: Text**

While I believe houses need to be built, putting a high density build of 400 homes in a village of 1000 homes is a huge increase in the resident population of that village. It changes the character of that village. If tmbc want to build dense housing on a site, may I suggest it leads onto a road with 2 lanes for traffic and is not attached to a quiet village with single lane access to the site. Perhaps a lower density of housing in smaller villages would be more acceptable to the community. Kings Hill style density has no place in a small village.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Size and density inform the feasibility of meeting the housing need. MMC and energy efficiency should be prioritised to meet climate and sustainability objectives which I consider have the highest importance.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Houses need to be built on small sites that are sustainable for the local population

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

I have concerns about affordability of housing (especially in one of the most expensive areas in the UK), and the

---

**User Response: Text**

difficulties in both buying a house for the first time, and affording rent. I also worry about infrastructure for new housing, size of housing sites (and how many houses are crammed into each one) etc.

GENERALL ACCOMMODATES PEOPLES NEEDS

Diversity of housing is key to supporting and developing a broad spectrum of businesses within the borough.

Infrastructure in the borough is creaking. Must be improved or premises built where they are likely to cause less demand on the road networks.

Infrastructure is very important for sustainable level of housing. It is apparent that existing infrastructure (roads, healthcare in particular) is already over-burdened resulting in queuing traffic, delays in access to healthcare, poor local transport and so on. It appears that the government wants to continue to build houses with infrastructure not keeping up.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment. Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

We need affordable housing, so smaller dwellings. The infrastructure locally already needs to be improved. Creating a pleasant environment should be a priority.

To ensure it is those that really need it that will benefit from this plan and that the carrying capacity of current settlements is not exceeded, which is already the case in some places across the borough.

The local plan should support the desire for first time buyers to get on the market, housing should be distributed across the borough instead of focusing on arbitrary areas, this will lessen the stress on local services. Garden communities are great places and should be promoted in the local plan.

no comment

The infrastructure must exist to support any housing development. Development should be future proofed as much as possible with regard to housing needs, sustainability and changes in working practices.

---

### User Response: Text

We must have affordable housing in the borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms that we normally see. Flats must be included.

Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by green belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (eg with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge

Modern methods of construction are important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We need affordable housing for local people and not just support London overspill which only pushes prices higher and ultimately resigns first time buyers to a lifetime of rent which quite frankly costs more than a mortgage

Large housing developments in rural areas have the potential to damage the natural environment and not be supported by adequate infrastructure causing overcrowded roads with consequent pollution and inadequate public transport. Rivers and the water table can be depleted because of increased water demand and polluted by sewerage.

Density and Distribution of housing is important to balance need for more homes and the need to maintain our local landscapes. Large dense plots must be focused in urban areas (for cost, transport, leisure and health). Dense, over distributed plots in rural is not viable and must not be considered.

---

**User Response: Text**

Size of housing sites must be restricted to not overpopulate the local areas

Infrastructure is key - no point developing if there are no proper road connections. Kent lanes are famously narrow and will cause accidents and deaths if more homes built in rural areas.

Density of housing development - because it's important not to have huge blocks high density housing in a rural area.

Distribution of housing across the borough (taking account of where the needs are generated) - because housing distribution needs to be sympathetic to the current townscapes / landscapes

Infrastructure supporting new homes delivered in a timely fashion - because health and wellbeing and future prospects of current and new residents is of the highest importance

Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) - because this should mean homes are more environmentally friendly and thermal efficient / cheaper to run

Size of housing (1-bedroom, 2-bedrooms, 3+ bedrooms) - because there needs to be a variation of house size so existing people in the borough have opportunities to upsize/downsize and still remain in the borough

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small and not 4/5/6-bedroom detached houses. Flats must be included.

Infrastructure in the borough is overloaded and must be improved.

Infrastructure must be improved before allowing any further development

I believe infrastructure and facilities must be calibrated to cope with increasing population, therefore they should be prioritised.

We need more smaller homes, cheaper to buy or rent, especially local authority or housing association houses. Too many large expensive houses are being built around our villages. Large sites would damage wellbeing. Infrastructure is also very important.

First time buyers facilitate others to move up the property ladder. Young families need appropriate housing and local amenity. The number of people with support needs may grow. These groups need the infra-structure mentioned in Q18. This is economically provided on larger urban sites and selected smaller sites in the urban or

---

**User Response: Text**

rural service centres. Providing such housing in rural areas only increases the need for transportation (subsidised buses) which drains public funds which are better spent on the actual Schools, Surgeries etc.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We need homes people can afford and the infrastructure to support any development

Houses need to be affordable and infrastructure needs to be in place before houses are built

Development should be infrastructure led and be in place before a single house is sold. Only then will we get communities to accept proportionate development.

Construction is bad for the planet and adds to climate change so it must be mitigated in the approach to meeting housing needs.

Infrastructure is under strain

To house the local population, zero emissions to help climate change

TO house the local population, zero emissions to help climate change

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Again, it's all about sympathetically growing the housing stock without creating infrastructure or environmental problems

---

**User Response: Text**

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small. Not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly and must be included. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Building homes for younger people. All new housing should be accessible housing.

Smaller developments to preserve the rural integrity of the borough.

Need to improve infrastructure to meet increased needs / it already experiences without extra pressures.

Local education, medical facilities, roads, transport are all of high priority.

To solve the housing problem, focus must be on making it affordable

Infrastructure is the most important: any housing site must have adequate infrastructure BEFORE new housing is allowed.

We support initiatives to provide affordable housing for those born in the T & M borough & local areas of Kent, who are currently priced out of the housing market.

We support initiatives to regenerate local urban towns & provide facilities including shops, infrastructure & facilities that can accommodate.

**We DO NOT support economic migration to the area putting pressure on local amenities & believe this supports Government levelling up policies.**

We support initiatives to provide affordable housing for those born in the T & M borough & local areas of Kent by policies of using permitted development rights allowing commercial buildings to be converted into homes. This is good sustainable reuse of brown field sites & original buildings with embodied energy being repurposed leading to cheaper affordable housing, saving material costs & preserving character of existing areas.

If sited in towns, this will help regenerate town areas in decline, bringing local people to spend & ensure shops & facilities are financially viable.



---

**User Response: Text**

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment

Improvements in infrastructure should be delivered at the same time or before new homes are built.

New homes should be distributed across the borough but also where infrastructure is in place to accommodate it.

There should be a mix of housing to reflect the demographic of the borough.

Building homes for younger people is important. All new housing should be of accessible design. Smaller developments to preserve the rural integrity of the borough. Need to improve infrastructure to meet increased needs - it already struggles without extra pressures of new builds.

Local education, medical facilities, roads, transport are of high priority.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned) - It is essential that we have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small and not four, five or six bedrooms. Flats must also be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise developments in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets of Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells that exert pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure - This must come first but we have to be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can identify and hire the doctors, nurses and teachers required to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change, for example with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainability is also vitally important in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to fully research and understand how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on the roads. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled to increase capacity due to the river layout. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements, if any, are necessary in advance of any building starting. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

---

### User Response: Text

Modern Methods of construction - This is extremely important because these can be fast to build, more cost-effective and have lower climate impact than traditional bricks and mortar, and can be constructed using carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and the opportunities to mitigate climate change.

There are so many pressures on infrastructure currently in T&MBC and Wateringbury in particular that any additional building will put untenable strains on an already stretched area

This is a community with a considerable rural section. Development which adversely affects that is contrary to the character of those areas and they should be guarded. The very nature of the garden of England is threatened if we fail to address these issues. The lack of medical, academic, transport and local amenities must be a first priority not making the issues worse.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high Type of housing (flat/house)

Other – please state below

standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment

---

### User Response: Text

Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change

**Density of Housing** – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing** – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first** - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions.

In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change

---

**User Response: Text**

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings. Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions. Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can send the doctors, nurses and teachers to start them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high type of housing (Tat/house) Other – please state below standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge. Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We have not seen sufficient housing developed to accessible needs and to meet the growing elderly population

The density in key areas have made areas such as Aylesford grow too rapidly and has increased pollution and stretched infrastructure to its limits

The North and East of the borough have seen uneven distribution that needs to be addressed

We have seen the lack of schools, poor roads, healthcare effected in the area and this needs to be addressed before new housing is built

We are finding the housing being built is meeting a perceived market requirement but not the requirement for residents in the borough

They seem sensible

They are the most sensible options

---

**User Response: Text**

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included . Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

To meet the diverse local housing needs

Zero Carbon has to be a major and absolute requirement of all new housing. Plans for new sites must demonstrate and include the use of renewable energy for all buildings. Infrastructure has to be developed alongside the housing to reduce the pressure on use of cars and public transport. This includes shops, schools, doctors, roads and green spaces

Build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers or make house builders and land owners wealthy.

First time buyers and small family homes are what is now needed.

Housing should be built with an awareness of the infrastructure needed to service the housing development and not put strain on areas unprepared for it

Good quality housing to meet local housing needs.

Affordability in the face of spiraling prices has never been so important as it is now..

First time buyers facing an almost unachievable prospect when trying to buy from current housing stock.

A good mix of house sizes to allow for up and down sizing.

any development will need a good infrastucture -- East Peckham does have the essentials anymore No GP No Dentist

- Due to spiralling prices, affordability has never been so important
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

---

### User Response: Text

We must have affordable housing in the borough , to achieve this it is unlikely they will be 4/5/6 bed houses . Flats should be included , the infrastructure is under considerable strain in the borough and must be improved . Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and provide a healthy environment .

I would like to see the needs of Gypsy and Travelling people to be taken into account with the provision of housing. Consultation with these communities is essential to provide what they need. Proper sites with proper facilities for travelling people please!

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)-** We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

**Density of Housing –** Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing –** We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first -** but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can send the doctors, nurses and teachers to start them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned) -** We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

**Density of Housing –** Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing –** We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be

---

### User Response: Text

used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first** - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

I fear developments being agreed before the infrastructure is there to support it - we dont want to be in a situation of fighting for improvements in the future. Developers have to be made to ensure that they add to communities needs and the infrastructure.

Proportion is everything. You should seek to preserve the current area and communities. If you are not mindful or interested in being proportionate, you seek only to eradicate our communities. Please do not seek to build a large development.

You need to ensure that you have the right infrastructures and road safety in place in order to support developing communities and it's important that more vulnerable groups in society also have access to basic opportunities affordable to other more privileged groups within the local community.

---

**User Response: Text**

I've chosen gypsy and traveller because they are unlikely to be online and say in the consultation they want somewhere to live! I've put self build and first time buyers because the housing stock we have is boring, and the self build homes are often engineered with low or no carbon footprint. I've put infrastructure because I'm a cyclist and I'm fed up of being pushed off the road or been given substandard paths that don;t go where I want to go.

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned):**

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

**Density of Housing:**

Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre, brownfield land, and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing:**

We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first:**

But we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar / wind / hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of their impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard. We need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction:**

Important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.



---

**User Response: Text**

It's important that those with a lower income should be able to buy or rent, which I presume is what is meant by 'affordable'. Too much emphasis has been given to supplying 3-5 bed detached homes when what is needed is well-designed terraced or semi detached housing. Being joined to a neighbour also cuts down on heating costs.

Infrastructure should always go hand-in-hand with development. Prime example of bad planning was at King's Hill when the surgery in West Malling was swamped by new patients.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved.

Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.

- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
  - Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
  - Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.
- \*Consideration to flooding and the environment should also be considered.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

? Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.

? First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.

? Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.

? Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

The best mix for best outcome.

---

**User Response: Text**

Need affordable housing with decent infrastructure and transport , so people commute shorted possible distance.

Garden community is good for mental health.

Good and enough infrastructures are important for quality of life.

Because they matter most to me where I live, and those would be issues that would affect me and my community most in my view.

All new housing must be sensitive and in keeping with the environment and life quality of existing residents.

Please refer earlier comments.

There are already numerous high priced properties in this area so affordable housing is preferable to accommodate young, local families but, once again, only on small sites.

Believe these are the main issues facing all communities; small, medium or large

To protect the Green Belt

there definitely needs to be more affordable housing for single/smaller families. Too many 4 bedroom houses seem to be built on new developments which are unaffordable for the average person. I also would like to see garages being built for smaller houses. Some developers only build garages for 4 bed homes. I use my garage for storage and could not be without it.

Infrastructure is paramount, simply adding housing will not solve any of the relevant long term aims. in addition to this quality and variety of housing is important ensuring that people can stay in the area even when a large house is not required.

There needs to be different types of houses available, they need to be affordable in today's market, many people now work from home so they need to be built to accommodate more home workers and people need their green spaces to make them feel positive.

**Once again I mention that East Malling is surrounded by Call for Sites in the proposed plan. In the previous plan there would have been a green belt extension to differentiate East from West Malling**

---

**User Response: Text**

**and Kings Hill. In this new plan there is no such proposal.**

**Therefore the proposed developments in T&MBC is again over-weighted in favour of the west of the borough at the expense of the east and north east. This is overwhelmingly unfair on residents of the east/north east of the borough and is a result of the failure of the council to get their previous plan adopted by the government.**

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Dense housing developments will always require extra development of a surrounding of infrastructure and services.

To avoid affecting the character of existing settlements. To ensure any new homes are fit for purpose in the 21st century with respect to environmental impact and living/working arrangements. To minimise impact on existing residents.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment. Community mental health and space for wildlife to exist

Because in my view they represent the needs and interest of the majority of people living in the borough. They are not my particular priorities.

to cover most peoples needs and affordability

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby

---

**User Response: Text**

towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can send the doctors, nurses and teachers to start them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the borough is overstretched and must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

New housing development should help to address climate change emergency.

You ask what 5 so I've chosen 5. You should perhaps ask respondents to rank these as that would show what

---

**User Response: Text**

preferences people have. It's not a well-thought-through method to determine ranking of importance.

I believe these meet the needs of TMBC residents and will allow people to stay in the area.

Too often developers are allowed to build droves of high density housing. This takes away any choice and forces people to live in this type of housing/environment. Most people would rather have low density housing with lots of green space around them. We need to be creating quality attractive housing where people have adequate space. Too often these housing developments are build with very narrow roads, no pavements, tiny gardens, just to max out the number of dwellings and maximise profit.

You should be prioritising the quality of the housing, ensuring it is low density and positively adding the the environment.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come First - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the

---

**User Response: Text**

sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

need for housing for younger/first-time buyers

Local people working locally need affordable housing.

The infrastructure needs to be in place in new developments in good time. Kings Hill was built with no shops, GPs or schools and it now has 3 schools etc. although there is still a big problem with the GP surgery which has just been moved rather than increased

to maintain character of a development (or allow for creation of character at new settlements) the size and location of any site needs to be considered against the existing dwellings and infrastructure.

The density of a development needs to be appropriate to provide enough housing whilst not ruining the chance of developing a local character.

make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

The size of properties must be limited to the truly needed sizes not aspirational 4,5,6,7 bedroom large detached dwellings.

Tenure of housing, if this plan is to provision for affordable housing, no new developments will depress current prices and new dwellings will be introduced to the market at the local rate, therefore tenure is important and the only way to make it more affordable is to ensure that affordable rent/social housing, and part buy/rent are the predominant types.

Private rents and market purchase tend to both have a monthly end cost to the purchaser of the current market rate which will likely be unaffordable or at the whims of credit availability.

Housing should be distributed according to NFFP principles to maintain Green Belt.

FUNCTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE MUST PREDATE ANY HOUSING BUILDING, not empty spaces provided as a sop to planners. this includes road improvements, flood prevention, telecoms, drainage and waste water processing changes as well as renewable energy capture.

Detailed waste water and flood and air quality pollution studies are needed as well as habitat impact studies.

If any of this takes place after planning approval or building starts we have already lost the ability to preserve our environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

---

### User Response: Text

Affordable Housing - We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land. We have available brownfield land, it must be used first. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green

Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We need to have a policy for housing gypsy and travellers.

Pay a visit to Welwyn Garden City to see a great example of a garden city.

Affordable housing is important, therefore smaller house and flats are needed.

Affordable housing at 80% of purchase price or rent is unaffordable for many residents and the situation locally is getting worse.

There is an urgent need for an affordable housing product which replicates social housing previously provided by councils or housing associations at typically 50-60% of market value/purchase price.

Large 4-5 bedroom houses may be favoured by developers and will bring in residents from outside but we need to meet the need for smaller and more affordable houses for the growing families of our own population.

---

## User Response: Text

Specialist housing for those with particular care needs requires greater focus.

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)**- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

**Density of Housing** – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing** – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first** - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high Type of housing (Tat/house)

Other – please state below

standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

To give confidence to the local community that the infrastructure can cope!



---

**User Response: Text**

The infrastructure in this area is already at breaking point, not enough secondary schools, doctors, roads are too busy, water supply too weak

I think I have covered my reasoning in my other answers above

There are enough houses in Tonbridge and Malling. THE community will change if any changes are made.

To fulfil the local requirements of household tenure, densities and size, to provide good varied and characterful design and to provide zero carbon homes generating renewable energy to address the climate change issues and support the Borough's Climate Strategy of reaching carbon neutral by 2030.

New housing developments should be located in the places where it is needed and where the infrastructure is adequate, include affordable rental homes for the reasons given elsewhere in this response and be proportionate in scale and density to the existing community.

Density of housing development - because it's important not to have huge blocks high density housing in a rural area.

Distribution of housing across the borough (taking account of where the needs are generated) - because housing distribution needs to be sympathetic to the current townscapes / landscapes

Infrastructure supporting new homes delivered in a timely fashion - because health and wellbeing and future prospects of current and new residents is of the highest importance. Delayed or missing infrastructure ends up disappointing new residents and leads to existing residents resenting new arrivals due to reduction in access to or quality of service

Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) - because this should mean homes are more environmentally friendly and thermal efficient / cheaper to run

Size of housing (1-bedroom, 2-bedrooms, 3+ bedrooms) - because there needs to be a variation of house size so existing people in the borough have opportunities to upsize/downsize and still remain in the borough

Infrastructure is already creaking. You can't build new houses without factoring in the demand that this will generate for services, the pressure this will place on our roads and public transport. You have to build the infrastructure in advance of new homes.

Large sites aren't appropriate for this region. Multiple small and medium sites, sustainably and sympathetically delivered spreads pressure across the region, with a priority on the existing large centres (mainly Tonbridge) that can take it.

Good quality, accessible housing is suitable for everyone. Too few accessible homes simply means that we have

---

**User Response: Text**

to pay to adapt them later on, leads to more use of expensive interim accommodation and forces people to move when decent housing would mean they could continue to live where they are.

Same response to Q11

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Development should only take place in urban areas or areas where infrastructure can cope rather than in rural areas.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the

---

**User Response: Text**

sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

See Q11

Same response as Q11.

Hard to prioritise five!

Due to spiralling prices, affordability has never been so important.

do you to spiralling prices, affordability has never been so important.

First time buyers are finding current housing stock and almost achievable prospect.

Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.

any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

Please see above, sorry.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to

---

**User Response: Text**

see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment

Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy selfsufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Affordable housing either to rent or for individuals to buy and live in (not buy to rent) so people can choose to stay in the area, make it their home and invest in it

Density to avoid heavily developed areas instead of semi rural ones which are better for everyones health

Infrastructure - to make sure facilities and amenities are available

Distribution - use brownfield sites first

Build using new technology to benefit the environment

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenSeld sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we

---

**User Response: Text**

can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staR them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self- suUciency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We should be concentrating on proven and sustainable local needs.

Infrastructure throughout the borough is not adequate as it stands, and needs to be improved as a precondition of building further residential properties.

Overly dense housing areas would ruin the character and heritage of the borough

Affordable properties to buy is a national crisis and needs to be addressed, but by abolishing corporate ownership and capping rental yields for properties rather than building houses that cannot be supported with existing infrastructure.

To protect the Green Belt

Providing specialist housing for older people is important because the housing needs of the increasing number and proportion of older people should be met for the plan to be positively prepared, effective and justified in line with the NPPF and PPG for Housing for older and disabled people. By meeting these needs the Borough will then experience a number of benefits including economic, social and environmental and ensure that older people can live healthier lives as detailed din our answer to question 18.

new housing needs to address the climate emergency and an aging society - therefore addressing housing mix,

---

**User Response: Text**

construction methodology and adaptable housing is key

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy selfsufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Many people are being priced out of the area they know as home. Travelling people suffer discrimination and their needs should be accommodated in the plan

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

---

**User Response: Text**

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions. Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge. Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

These housing matters are the most relevant to cross boundary issues.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses

---

**User Response: Text**

built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings. Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions. Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can send the doctors, nurses and teachers to start them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge. Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Refer to previous answers re affordability, custom/self build and infrastructure

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

First time buyers need help in an area where property is expensive. Small brownfield developments are a suggestion.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings. Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on



---

**User Response: Text**

settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions. Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge. Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Having a home where people are content leads to a happy community. Brexit, Covid, Climate change has not only led to an economic downturn but people have changed. We need to adapt to this changing world and put people first.

Give people opportunities to help themselves.

Greater attention should be paid to the need to minimise traffic congestion and air pollution than is evident in the proposals. This is in addition to my explanation of 'Other' above.

MMC is important to ensure the best builds and the rest I believe are important to ensure a healthy community mix without catering to a specific group. It also ties in to the ecological concerns previously stated. We should be aiming for a healthy housing market that people can engage in, not an unhealthy one propped up by support for a limited group of those otherwise priced out of the market

You should seek to preserve the current area and communities and not eradicate them. Any new housing needs to be proportionate to reflect this.

Infrastructure needs to be in place and variety of housing to meet current need.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must

---

**User Response: Text**

therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.  
Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved.  
Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)**- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

**Density of Housing** – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing** – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first** - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases, roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon-neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self- sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

All of life housing should be implemented where possible. Accessible housing in the borough is woefully inadequate and must be addressed as a matter of urgency.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough.

Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

---

**User Response: Text**

Infrastructure in the Borough is very poor - must be improved.

Housing must be built with better insulation to use less energy going forward.

Greater attention should be paid to the need to minimise traffic congestion and air pollution than is evident in the proposals. This is in addition to my explanation of 'Other' above.

Affordability is essential, especially at times at times of financial stress.  
Infrastructure around new homes is a major element of settling in the area.  
People with various needs (elderly, disabled, etc) are becoming a larger proportion of the population as a whole.  
Safety of the newly built homes is paramount (see Grenfell tragedy) hence modern building techniques and standards are a priority.

Size and density of housing developments need to be considered especially near smaller rural settlements. The quantity of these sites around the same rural settlement should also be restricted as in the case of East Malling where there are a large number of possible sites and will have the same negative effect as a larger development close by

Housing needs to be affordable for local people to prevent the area turning into a build to rent area increasing the wealth of greedy landlords and preventing local people being able to afford to buy

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

It's what I believe is required

I am concerned that the existing health, educational, service industries and providers would not be able to cope with increased number of community members.

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

Housing currently is not affordable for many, housing density is too great, garden communities sound like a sustainable way forward, I think it is also important we provide space for alternative social groups and we really do need to have better infrastructure to support existing housing needs as well as new ones.

---

**User Response: Text**

Proportional development where infrastructure is developed at the same time as new houses are built. There shouldn't be any lag time between houses being built and the capability for the area to support them.

Housing needs to be affordable, MMC is more efficient, having adequate infrastructure is essential and the new housing should be fairly spread across the borough, not huge urbanisations in just a few areas as a quick win.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns . It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites not protected by Green Belt designation are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure has to come first, and we need to be absolutely sure that when we have new medical facilities and schools, we can actually find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network already struggling to cope with existing traffic can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions which in many cases cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current waste water infrastructure and to identify which Waste Water Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary – BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

In East Peckham we have old people looking to downsize and young people needing to buy first time, neither is accommodated all that well currently.

I believe that modern methods of construction are eco friendly and efficient. Solar panels and heat pumps should be standard.

Housing should be generated according to demand

Infrastructure should be in place prior to house building to ensure the developer meets commitments made during

---

**User Response: Text**

planning

My selections are not priorities - the plan should address most of the matters with equal seriousness - just those that, at a glance, seem the most important.

growth should be balanced: with new houses comes increased pressure on resources, and so any growth must be supported by schools, retail and increased capacity of transport etc.

Important that housing is available to all that need it and that the appropriate infrastructure is in place so that people don't have to travel miles for medical/school/shopping/public transport.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the

---

**User Response: Text**

sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Whilst we have not selected any particular housing matter (in response to Q.18), it is vital that the Council brings forward a Local Plan that includes a range and mix of sites that will allow each of the matters (and types/tenures of housing) to be delivered.

N/a

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have Affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first -be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, with the doctors, nurses and teachers to start them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high

Type of housing (Tat/house)

Other – please state below

We also need to ensure that cycle/active travel infrastructure is included to avoid adding to the already congested roads

standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the

---

**User Response: Text**

current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability

points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficient and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

infrastructure must be at the forefront, there is no point building properties with out it.

It is important to have some new housing in the borough but we do not need large scale house building in Borough Green. We do not want big density housing developments in large sites. Build houses for local people not to attract 1000's more to the area.

We must ensure that developments happen only in the areas where infrastructure can cope .

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We believe all these matters are important but we have made our choice on the basis that it is important to provide housing which is attractive to everyone and allows everyone to find a place within the community. We also believe that it is important that all new houses should be as energy efficient as possible and for that reason modern building approaches should be encouraged.

As above the green belt land is important and the proposal is just too big that there isn't enough infrastructure

Infrastructure is the key here. Only when that is in place will communities accept future development

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)** - We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses

---

### User Response: Text

built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

**Density of Housing** – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing** – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first** - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre Brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first- but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in



---

**User Response: Text**

terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Local housing should be built for local needs. Not for the profits of developers/landowners

All the items listed are relevant and will need consideration.

The points I have chosen are relevant to me, someone who lives and works in the borough.

That's local democracy in action.

Creating affordable homes for the younger generation to set down roots in the community is essential to a thriving community. As is appropriate housing for people with issues with mobility due to disability or age.

First and foremost, accessible and affordable housing is essential.

Infrastructure is very weak in the borough, and without improvement then all other plans will fail, or fail to be implemented effectively.

Condensing housing in three areas is not sustainable. It makes very little sense without putting an appropriate infrastructure in place first.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must

therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved.

Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be

---

**User Response: Text**

created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Infrastructure should go before any housing developments. There is a need for housing in this area that local working/young people can afford.

Avoid large scale, super dense housing areas. Ensure houses use modern methods of construction to enable them to be as energy efficient as possible, in both construction and their longer life.

I think it essential that there are sufficient homes for people with disabilities or mobility issues - this also complies with the social care act and the drive to enable people to remain at home for as long as possible.

I don't agree with large developments in rural locations, however where these are tacked on to an already urban environment this seems like the least worst solution.

To ensure housing is distributed well where necessary and focussed in locations recommended in previous answers, with high quality and varied design that promotes a healthy lifestyle.

Affordable housing for social rent is essential to enable people on lower incomes to continue to live in the area and with a decent quality of life.

Accessible housing, e.g. wheelchair friendly, is needed for an ageing population, as well as to meet the needs of younger people who have mobility impairments.

Homeworking opportunities are a trend for the future and will improve sustainable living, reducing the need to clutter up the roads with commuters in cars and improving the vitality of the villages in particular.

Timely development of infrastructure is crucial to support a significant increase in population from development. There is already a shortage of GPs in the area.

Energy-efficient buildings are vital for reducing carbon emissions and for affordability, as it seems likely that the cost of utilities will continue to rise.

See response to Q2

It's clear we need more dwellings but I am very concerned about infrastructure and capacity on local services. I want to ensure that they are properly considered before any houses are approved.

---

### User Response: Text

Infrastructure has to be the priority for any building plan. Development should not be so big that they impact on the existing communities. there should be a proportional mix of housing allowing for rent, to buy and first time buyer at the top of the list

The housing for special needs, elderly etc. are generally underprovided for possibly because developers do not make as much profit from them.

I would like villages to remain as villages. New housing kept to a minimum. The beautiful Kentish countryside and green belt to remain untouched.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high Type of housing (flat/house) Other green building can include, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building.

Affordable Housing to buy and rent:

1. As set out in our answers to questions 5, 6, 11 and 12 and as acknowledged throughout the draft plan, housing affordability both in terms of housing to buy and rent is extremely poor in the Borough and a matter that needs to be urgently addressed.

Distribution:

1. Linked to this there is a need to deliver new housing across the borough in areas where the demand arises having regard to the two housing market areas. In this regard we have favoured Spatial option 3 in our response to questions 3 and 4.

---

### User Response: Text

1. This would focus development within the Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements which are well distributed geographically to ensure a reasonable spread across the Borough.

#### Size of housing sites:

1. As explained in our answer to question 13 it is extremely important that the plan brings forward a range of site sizes, particularly small and medium sized sites that can deliver swiftly in the early years of the plan to address affordability and land supply issues.

#### Infrastructure:

The timely delivery of new and / or improvements to existing infrastructure alongside new housing developments is important to ensure that new and existing places function well. Concerns regarding pressure on existing services and facilities is often a key reason for objection from local residents both to allocations and then subsequent planning applications. Early consideration of infrastructure requirements can therefore provide confidence to local communities and reduce these concerns.

Affordable housing- we must have affordable housing in the Borough

Density of Housing- appropriate density to make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of housing- distribute according to the principles of the NPPF.

Infrastructure- all developments by sustainable and using Green Technology and sustainable in terms of impact on roads.

Modern Methods of construction- important because these can be fast to build low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for sustainability and to mitigate climate change.

They are what I see the needs, too many large estate style homes are being built.

Low density mixed housing spread across is preferred.

Large urban areas should not be the focus of development as this will generate further social, economic, infrastructure, and environmental issues. Development should be distributed across the region with smaller developments.

We need affordable and attractive housing for all members of the community to live side by side.

---

**User Response: Text**

The options selected in order to achieve diverse housing stock which will appeal to all age groups.

Secure rented accommodation - that is actually affordable to local people - should be a priority.

Density should be optimised to reduce greenfield land take.

Infrastructure should be provided to support new homes – but new homes should not be built to support (unsustainable) new road building.

Housing should reflect social need rather than be a vehicle for developer profits. Although Tonbridge and Malling is constrained by adverse legislation and 12 years of spending cuts, it should do all it can to support the genuine needs of all of its residents.

**Density of Housing** – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing** – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first** - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change

---

## User Response: Text

Housing development should be small scale to meet local needs and not to thwart levelling up initiatives by further encouraging inward migration. Also any development must factor in infrastructure improvement

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms each with their own bathroom. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to recognise the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) are exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Specialist Housing for people with particular care needs - we need to see that properties suitable for an ageing, more physically frail population are included with access to health care and social activities to maintain independence. There is also a need to ensure accommodation for younger disabled people with care needs within communities.

Density of Housing Development: To maximise the brownfield land in town centre first and maintain low rise development in rural regions

Distribution of Housing: In accordance with NPPF's principles and retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Use brownfield land.

Infrastructure: New medical facilities and schools with adequate staff. Tonbridge is already struggling to cope with existing traffic and it is difficult to remodel the road network.

---

**User Response: Text**

Modern Methods: To mitigate the climate change factors by using sustainable materials and methodologies

No response

The government tells us we need more housing in this area. Then let it be small developments, outside AONB and Green Belt with the minimum disruption to the environment and the population who already live here.

Yes ideals. Yes undoubtedly more costly but so much better to build it RIGHT from the beginning as opposed to regret in the future because you got it WRONG.

Allowing a diverse supply of housing to meet a diverse set of needs

The Council's evidence demonstrates significant housing need which must be delivered quickly and sustainability. The housing priorities we have identified are particularly applicable to that challenge. All housing matters are relevant to the emerging plan, but focusing on the deliverability of well planned, high quality strategic sites well located to higher order settlements offers the best prospects for securing wider housing objectives.

We need human scale development, identifiable rural communities (not suburban sprawl) with good infrastructure. We also need to be aware that infrastructure is not just built but the professionals to staff our schools, healthcare and social care facilities. Professionals who wish to work in highly built up areas will be attracted to the buzz of large towns and cities rather than areas which used to be rural but have become

---

**User Response: Text**

characterless with over-development. Those who enjoy working in more rural areas will go to those places which remain rural.

No response

People need affordable and permanent homes. Infrastructure to support homes is critical for communities to develop and thrive. Housing sites should be of a size to support a sense of community and well being, not a return to the soulless estates of the 50s and 60s.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling



---

**User Response: Text**

through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment

The high price of housing in the UK is turning us into a rentier economy, stifling innovation. We need to bring the price of houses down for big and small picture reasons. We also need to be building the sort of houses that people can live in rather than those that take minimum requirements to be the actual requirements

With prices increasing affordable housing is needed but it is not sensible to put it where the infrastructure is not developed. Putting low income families who have not got a car in rural areas where the transport links are not good doesn't make sense, especially thinking about how they would be able to do the most basic of things like visit a GP or do a weekly shop.

Best quality of life for all

Infrastructure must come first - but it must be ensured that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff the are found. It needs to be ensured that every new development does not adversely impact on our road network, the capacity of the current wastewater and clearwater infrastructure.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

---

**User Response: Text**

Ensuring affordable housing is key. If we are going to give up our precious countryside for development then it shouldn't be to line the pockets of developers, it should be for the benefit of our residents.

Modern methods of construction presumably means that construction is done in a more sustainable way.

Housing density is an important consideration as it has an impact on quality of life, capacity of services, the actual long term value of the housing stock.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Housing is a priority for local people, it is not a priority to attract incomers to an already overcrowded area.

Affordable Housing to buy (first time buyers) - We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.  
Affordable Housing to rent (council owned) - We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.  
Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions. Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.  
Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate

---

**User Response: Text**

impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Housing that is developed now should be constructed for longevity and not become an undesirable slum that we saw with 60s/70s built council housing.

We have not seen sufficient housing developed to accessible needs and to meet the growing elderly population

The density in key areas have made areas such as Aylesford grow too rapidly and has increased pollution and stretched infrastructure to its limits

The North and East of the borough have seen uneven distribution that needs to be addressed

We have seen the lack of schools, poor roads, healthcare effected in the area and this needs to be addressed before new housing is built

We are finding the housing being built is meeting a perceived market requirement but not the requirement for residents in the borough

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)**- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing** – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions. Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads

---

### User Response: Text

and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to rainwater drainage, which is already a particular issue in some parts of Hildenborough

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

no comment

I feel these are important to all new construction as well as solar panels and such for environmental support

**Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)**- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

**Density of Housing** – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brown field land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

**Distribution of Housing** – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brown field land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on green field sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

**Infrastructure must come first** - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can send the doctors, nurses and teachers to start them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high Type of housing (Tat/house) Other – please state below standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/ hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are

---

**User Response: Text**

necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

**Modern Methods of construction** - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Whilst we have not selected any particular housing matter (in response to Q.18), it is vital that the Council brings forward a Local Plan that includes a range and mix of sites (including sizes) that will allow each of the matters (and types/tenures of housing) to be delivered.

Need for smaller affordable homes, on smaller and medium sized developments – less need for ‘executive homes’ on larger developments.

There’s got to be joined up thinking

I feel really strongly that the Council should not allow development if it is clear there is insufficient infrastructure to support increasing the population density. The Council has a duty to increase affordability for buyers and renters living locally. In addition, the Council needs to think about the housing for the vulnerable - the elderly, the disabled and those with other special needs.

There are already too many houses in my area, too many people and cars, too much pollution and rubbish. Any new building should only be eco homes with green roofs or underground homes which minimise the impact on the environment.

Building homes for younger people and affordability of homes. Smaller developments.

Need more affordable housing for Borough.

Supporting documents to the Local Plan show that the local housing market is over-heated, therefore we need to reduce the high prices, rents and affordability ratios.

Hildenborough schools already have children on waiting lists and that is without allowing for the demand that will soon be generated by hundreds of people who will move to the two developments in Hildenborough.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings. Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions. Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high Type of housing (Type/house) Other – please state below standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity. We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge. Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy efficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we

---

**User Response: Text**

make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenbelt sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be

sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using

solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tunbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building

---

**User Response: Text**

starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Affordable housing to rent (council owned) - We must have more affordable housing in the Borough. House size must be small not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of the town centre brownfield land.

We must ensure that when new schools and medical facilities are planned, we are able to find the relevant personnel to staff them

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved.

Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6



---

**User Response: Text**

bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Needs to be affordable housing for all members of society.

**You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers**

The need for housing, particularly affordable housing in all its forms, is acute in this borough. Ensuring these needs are met where they are needed most, in locations that reduce the need to travel, are matters critical to delivering many of the Plans objectives. Ensuring the contribution from urban sources is realistic and sustainable will therefore be key. The Council must ensure the impacts of densification are robustly assessed and articulated in subsequent consultations, so that informed responses can be sought. This includes the acknowledgment that the need for family housing is less likely to be fulfilled through greater densification of the boroughs urban areas, and options to meet such needs on the edge of larger settlements are more likely as a consequence. Proactively identifying and allocating lands to meet such needs has the benefit of assisting with infrastructure delivery planning and funding, as opposed to less certain windfall sources , which by their nature are more difficult to predict and plan for in cumulative infrastructure terms.

**Affordability**

Almost impossible for first time buyers

Housing needs to match amenities. East Peckham has no doctors or dentist.

To fulfil the local requirements of household tenure, densities and size, to provide good varied and characterful design and to provide zero carbon homes generating renewable energy to address the climate change issues and support the Borough's Climate Strategy of reaching carbon neutral by 2030.

---

## User Response: Text

- Affordability, particularly for first-time buyers, is a real challenge.
- We need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.

Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so  
First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.

I (outline briefly)? • Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.

• Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

- To fulfil the local requirements of household tenure, densities, and size, to provide good varied and characterful design and to provide zero carbon homes generating renewable energy to address the climate change issues and support the Borough's Climate Strategy of reaching carbon neutral by 2030.

- Needs a good mix of how size are to allow for both upsizing and downsizing in particular to first time buyers growing families needing larger homes are more mature residents wishing to downsize.
- Due to spiralling prices affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Anyone develop needs suitable surrounding infrastructure and you choose that can adequately support any additional development for example E Peckham has no GP surgery.

'Affordable housing' at 80 per cent of purchase price or rent is unaffordable for many residents, and as the Reg 18 document states, the situation in TMBC has been getting worse for many years.

Many people employed in essential professional posts in nursing, police, teaching and social care are unable to purchase their own home. Reports from Joseph Rowntree Trust, Shelter and others have illustrated that that the problem is widespread in the UK, and particularly acute in the south east where house prices reflect high London wages.

WMPC does not accept the suggestion that a greater volume of house building will bring prices down, as the number of houses required to satisfy demand and to start to drive prices down in the area is simply not viable.

This is to a large extent a symptom of having a rail connection into London and is evidenced by the way in which TMBC has maintained a high volume of construction over a long period of time, with prices remaining higher than the average for the South East and Kent according to a recent KCC Select Committee Report.

TMBC itself accepts that it is impossible in any event to build sufficient houses to meet the demand in this popular part of the South East.

Shelter and Joseph Rowntree Trust reports suggest that in over three quarters of authorities low-income families are unable to purchase 'affordable housing' and are driven into the private rented sector where rents have also

---

**User Response: Text**

rapidly increased in excess of pay.

There is an urgent need for an affordable housing product which replicates Social Housing previously provided by Councils or Housing Associations at typically 50 to 60% of market rent or purchase price.

Locally, too high a proportion of new housing is of larger 4- and 5-bedroom houses, driving costs up even further, without meeting existing local demand which is for smaller properties.

New developments need appropriate infrastructure delivered in a timely fashion. If this is not done, it puts even greater pressure on the services provided for existing residents. The reduction in Government Grant for expanding, for instance, existing schools and surgeries means that additional capacity is increasingly found only on new developments, resulting in children and patients travelling much further to school and GPs with consequences for climate change and increased costs to residents.

No housing matter can be isolated as the most important; they all inter-relate.

22

TMBC need to allocate a suite of sites that are deliverable to meet housing needs. This needs to be made up of a range of site sizes to meet different demands and maintain a rolling 5 year supply, and spread across the Borough to meet the different needs of the HMA's that influence the Borough. They also need to provide a range of tenures to meet the requirements of the Borough, including the affordable needs of the Borough, and they need to address the infrastructure requirements they generate.

In respect of comments on other housing factors. It is essential that housing supply is boosted in line with the NPPF and sustainability agenda. This has been a consistent theme since the first NPPF was published. To achieve this, the standard method is in place to ensure that all LPAs provide the housing that is needed in their area. Affordable housing comes hand in hand with market housing and combined, these help to ensure sustainable, mixed and diverse communities.

With regards to design, MMC is becoming more widely used as a method to build and deliver homes quicker. In some locations design can be more tightly controlled but, in most instances, flexibility is important to allow for innovation, use of more sustainable materials and techniques and to enable developments to come forward quicker. The NDG is a material consideration. It is not therefore necessary for separate local design policies unless relating to specific issues, characters or features of unique distinctiveness.

With specific regard to Q19, only 5 can be selected but it is questionable whether only 5 should be shortlisted particularly as they relate to various issues focused around both housing needs and housing design. Ultimately TMBC must ensure that varying housing needs are being met across the borough through a range of sites that can deliver in the short, medium and longer term. The type of housing that should be delivered should be determined based on needs to ensure access to housing and choice for the community. MMC can be an important part of this and early delivery; and supporting sites such as site 59764 can help to deliver homes now, reducing heavy reliance on larger development sites that may not come forward for a long time.

Quality of life for residents. The size of houses selected to allow for low cost and family homes. The reason people move to the country is to get a better quality of living, so the provision of smaller one-, two- or three-bedroom freehold houses is more suitable than blocks of flats with extortionate service charges.

---

**User Response: Text**

Quality of life for residents. The size of houses selected to allow for low cost and family homes. The reason people move to the country is to get a better quality of living, so the provision of smaller one, two or three bedroom freehold houses is more suitable than blocks of flats with extortionate service charges.

You need to have sites that are deliverable to meet your housing needs, they need to be made up of a range of sizes to meet different demands and maintain a rolling 5 year supply, and spread across the Borough to meet the different needs of the HMA's that influence the Borough. They also need to provide a range of tenures to meet the requirements of the Borough, including the affordable needs of the Borough, and they need to address the infrastructure requirements they generate. Allocating the land east of Carpenters Lane/ north of The Paddock, Hadlow would help address all of these factors – its deliverable, is relatively small in scale so can be delivered early in the plan period, it is located within the West Kent HMA so will help address the needs of that area, it can provide a range of house types, and tenures and would address the infrastructure requirements that development here would generate.

There is a need to plan for full housing needs. Given there is clarity on these matters we question the benefit in implying that there is an element of choice of which types of housing take priority. Nevertheless, in this instance our client has a desire to genuinely deliver good quality housing aimed at local people given the limited growth in East Peckham in recent years.

As outlined above, there is a need to plan for full housing needs. Given there is clarity on these matters Fernham Homes question the benefit in implying that there is an element of choice of which types of housing take priority. Nevertheless, Fernham Homes has a strong track record of delivering high quality housing including accessible and affordable housing (including bungalows, where relevant) and working with partners to deliver specialist housing, such as extra care, at various densities and on sites of various sizes.

Whilst we have not selected any particular housing matter (in response to Q.18), it is vital that the Council brings forward a Local Plan that includes a range and mix of sites (including sizes) that will allow each of the matters (and types/tenures of housing) to be delivered.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

---

### User Response: Text

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. Infrastructure in the Borough is creaking badly - must be improved. Garden communities would allow new infrastructure and facilities to be created as well as providing a pleasant, healthy environment.

Housing is a priority for local people, it is **not** a priority to attract incomers to an already overcrowded area.

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

Keep development small. Local needs, affordable and use local builders.

- **Affordability, particularly for first-time buyers, is a real challenge.**
- **We need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.**
- **Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure.**

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

**You need to build the houses that are needed for local people that are affordable to all not to those that can buy and leave the area or rent out at high rental markets. That attracts people to the village who aren't interested in the community aspect of the village.**

Development should be infrastructure led and be in place before a single house is sold. Only then will we get communities to accept proportionate development.

#### **Economic development – what are the issues?**

Key economic development issues which the Local Plan can help to address

- High land values and a shortage of employment land and premises for established and growing businesses as well as those looking to locate in the borough.

Lack of investment in strategic infrastructure and congestion on local transport networks

---

**User Response: Text**

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure, for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

Housing is a priority for local people, the younger generations within the community, however must be done in a manner in which does not adversely effect the countryside and green belt

It seems clear from the Local Plan that affordable housing is a major issue and so should be given priority. But there must be a suitable infrastructure.

Housing should support the whole community.

- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers.

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers.

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

Housing is a priority for local people. It is **not** a priority to attract incomers to an already overcrowded area, which cannot cope with the additional numbers of residents

Housing is a priority for local people. It is **not** a priority to attract incomers to an already overcrowded area, which cannot cope with the additional numbers of residents.

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.

---

**User Response: Text**

Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

Avoiding discrimination and managing impact on the local area.

We have outlined some of the reasons and proposals to partly address the key issues, as follows:

? Affordable housing – this is our greatest housing need, so ‘robust’ policies should mandate a higher proportion of affordable housing (e.g. 50%, not 40%), as discussed above (Q.12).

? Density of housing – we are concerned about the potential of over-development of our towns, like in Tonbridge, where there are significant existing infrastructure/highways pressures/constraints. In addition, we have concerns about the over-development of our town centres, with a number of inappropriate tower blocks proposed in Tonbridge over recent years, particularly on land that surrounds conversation areas; with a loss of the sense of place, where new developments do not respect the local character/siting context. We are also concerned about more widespread garden infilling, with a loss of adequate garden amenity and the potential to harm the character of local estates, where open spaces and gardens predominate. As such, we advocate policies setting-out minimum garden depths (e.g. 11m) and setting-out a presumption against the loss of garden land, unless it represents a comprehensive redevelopment of several whole land plots.

? Infrastructure (schools, roads, ...) – please refer to our comments above in Q.11. We need policies that adopt an ‘infrastructure first’ approach (inc. providing adequate community facilities and transport capacity), to ensure that the required infrastructure is delivered to support the sustainable development that our communities need. We live in south-west Tonbridge, where there is currently a lack of local primary school places\*. Without the inclusion of such facilities, it will put more pressure on existing services and people will need to travel further (e.g. take children to the other side of town), which is likely to promote private car usage, rather than active travel, and increase the town’s congestion issues. We are also concerned about the potential impact of Permitted Development Rights (PDR), in-terms of office conversions to flats, with the lack of developer contributions, despite these schemes having a disproportionate impact on local infrastructure networks and services. It is also acknowledged that the expansion of PDR has resulted in substandard housing, with tiny windowless flats being built, without proper planning scrutiny. This is further discussed in Q.29 (plus see Q 30), incl. withdrawing PDRs under Article 4.

? Size of housing – as noted above, affordable housing is our greater housing need, so logically we need to build a higher proportion of starter homes and first rentals. However, it often appears that we do not build the right types/sizes of houses, with too many unfordable large houses and luxury flats built, which saturates the local housing markets and results in low market absorption rates/lengthy build-outs, as noted in the Letwin3 report. Also, if more bungalows were built, to help meet the needs of an aging population, it might encourage older people to down-size and free-up the existing larger housing stock. Another key consideration is the height of houses/apartment blocks. As noted above, there have been a number of inappropriate tower blocks proposed in Tonbridge. These proposals represented significant over-development, plus were often completely out of keeping with existing buildings (e.g. in-terms of height) and did not respect the historical setting. Additionally, as acknowledged in Paragraph 5.9.9 (Reg. 18 L.P.), the design of developments

---

## User Response: Text

within the setting of an AONB is paramount to minimise the visual impact. As such, we support the adoption of site-specific policies, with height limits. This is particularly important for potential sites in south-west Tonbridge; being in the landscape setting of the AONB (<500m), with views over a flat floodplain, so houses must be limited to 2-storeys.

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.

Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

### KEY TRANSPORT ISSUES

**(1) Bus** - Provide funding to establish new bus services which can become commercially sustainable.

**(2) Rail** - Improve access to and facilities at local stations, especially for cycling, walking and disabled passengers.

**(3) Cycling** - Improve the availability of dedicated and segregated cycle routes across the borough.

**(4) Walking** – Improve the footpath network especially in rural locations where pavements may be inadequate and provide safe crossings.

**(5) Roads** - Provide additional road and junction capacity only where this is necessary.

**(6) Parking** – The provision of sufficient parking in residential developments and urban areas.

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads



---

**User Response: Text**

cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

**You need to build the houses that are needed for local people that are affordable to all not to those that can buy and leave the area or rent out at high rental markets. That attracts people to the village who aren't interested in the community aspect of the village.**

Affordable Housing to rent (council owned)- We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Size of houses built must therefore be small, not 4/5/6 bedrooms. Flats must be included.

Density of Housing – Housing must be at an appropriate density so that we make the most efficient use of town centre brownfield land and retain the harmony of low rise development in rural settings.

Distribution of Housing – We need to see housing distributed according to the principles of the NPPF and with regard to the criteria for retaining the Metropolitan Green Belt. Where we have available brownfield land it must be used first. We need to acknowledge the two housing markets (Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells) exerting pressure on the borough and recognise that these are based on settlement relationships to the largest nearby towns. It is crucial that any additional development on greenfield sites, not protected by Green Belt designation, are located as close as possible to existing transport links such as railway stations and motorway junctions.

Infrastructure must come first - but we must be sure that when new medical facilities and schools are planned, we can find the doctors, nurses and teachers to staff them. We need to be sure that every new development will be sustainable in terms of energy efficiency and climate change (e.g. with high standards of insulation, carbon capturing green roofs, energy generation using solar/ wind/hydro power designed into the building. Sustainable in terms of its impact on our road network too. In the case of Tonbridge we need to see how a road network, already struggling to cope with existing traffic, can cope with even more cars on roads and junctions. In many cases roads cannot be adequately remodelled (because of the river layout cutting through the town) to increase capacity.

We need to see a detailed Water Cycle Study to ascertain the capacity of the current wastewater infrastructure and to identify which Wastewater Treatment Works will deal with each development and whether the existing infrastructure will cope and what improvements if any are necessary BEFORE any building starts. The same applies to clean water supplies, given the seasonal peaks in demand from Network Rail at their Tonbridge West Goods Yard we need to be sure that additional demand will not mean more road tankers travelling through the Air Quality Monitoring Area in Tonbridge High Street and that demand can be ensured for all eventual sites in

---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge.

Modern Methods of construction - important because these can be fast to build, low cost and have lower climate impact than concrete and bricks, and built with carbon neutral materials. They may also allow for the sustainability points made above regarding high standards of insulation, energy self-sufficiency and opportunities to mitigate climate change.

Same as previous answers. Smaller sites, more self-build opportunities, infrastructure that can support developments.

Avoiding discrimination and managing impact on the local area.

There is a need to progress the population of Borough Green, not to attract those from elsewhere. As families grow they deserve to be able to stay in the village and not be forced out.

Size of sites should remain at a four plot maximum

- Due to spiralling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any new development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.
- No Accessible Train line particularly at weekends
- Insufficient educational needs for pre-school and infants to support growing population

- Due to spiralling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.
- No Accessible Train line particularly at weekends
- Insufficient educational needs for pre-school and infants to support growing population

We need to provide for all people, and we need to be seen as sharing the burden over the Borough, and also meeting the demand. It is lack of supply that causes the house prices to remain high, following the basic economic principle of supply and demand.

Refer to separate Boyer Representations Statement document.

---

**User Response: Text**

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

We must have affordable housing in the Borough. Therefore the sizes of the houses to be built must be SMALL - not 4, 5 & 6 bedrooms. Flats must be included. The current infrastructure needs to be improved now before additions are made. Garden communities to be created as well for the well-being of the community as a whole!

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

**You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers**

Housing is a priority for local people, it is not a priority to attract incomers to an already overcrowded area.

Housing is a priority for local people, it is not a priority to attract incomers to an already overcrowded area.

You need to build houses for local community needs, not to attract incommers. We have ample overpriced for these people already!

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not attract incomers

---

**User Response: Text**

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

**Small sites with small affordable homes that the local infrastructure can accommodate**

**You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers**

Housing is a priority for local people, it is **not** a priority to attract incomers to an already overcrowded area.

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

The location and nature of development should be of high quality and proportional to the needs of all. Supported by the necessary infrastructure.

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

You need to build the houses that are needed for local people, not to attract incomers

Because Garden communities could lead to the one thing I absolutely object to - Borough Green Garden City

Avoiding discrimination and managing impact on the local area.

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham, Hale Street and

---

**User Response: Text**

Snoll Hatch has no GP surgery, but the GP surgery we have to use in Paddock Wood is already over subscribed with all the new housed being built there.

Infrastructure is vitally important as in size of sites and housing. All should be kept at a minimum.

Answer: Development should be infrastructure led and be in place before a single house is sold. Only then will we get communities to accept proportionate development.

- Due to spiraling prices, affordability has never been so important.
- First time buyers are finding current housing stock an almost unachievable prospect.
- Need a good mix of house sizes to allow for both upsizing and downsizing.
- Any development needs suitable surrounding infrastructure - for example East Peckham has no GP surgery.

Housing is a priority for local people, the younger generations within the community, however must be done in a manner in which does not adversely effect the countryside and green belt

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:12:24. Total records: 559

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 23] What are your reasons for selecting these partic...

### User Response: Text

Bus services are infrequent and restrict accessibility

Without better bus services we all rely on cars. Our roads are at or above capacity and need to be upgraded and repaired, but by bringing back busses maybe, just maybe, some of us will ditch the car.

There are continuak road closures around here affecting virtually every journey. The infrastructure cannot cope with the current level of traffic/people.

There was a dedicated cycling lane along the A25 between Platt and Borough Green. This has been removed and should be reinstated to encourage commuters to cycle to the station.

Traffic pollution is unacceptable in villages along the A25 and could be remedied by building slip roads to Sevenoaks on the M26, at the junction with the A21 and M25.

Builds community, safer and is what the community of Tonbridge need

School bus routes should be massively improved and made affordable so that there is far less school traffic in mornings and afternoons in term time. Parents should be strongly discouraged from dropping off children at school by car

There has to be sensible thinking on this. Now the pavements have been divided into Pedestrian and Cycle but the Pedestrian is on the inside and overgrown hedges etc make them walk in the cycle paths. It is ridiculous. KCC does not maintain the edges of the pavements. Cyclists should have some sort of warning mechanism.

Junctions in the town centre are often congested and cycling markings are often unclear and therefore not always free from pedestrians (i.e Brook Street)

More needs to be done to encourage safe cycling

Bus services are vital for members of the community who do not drive. Improved access to stations is very important for connectivity to the rest of the country. The road network in Tonbridge is often at capacity and needs significant improvement; a new bypass to direct traffic out of the town centre would be welcome.

We need to encourage active travel and use of public transport. Upgrading roads leads to more car use.

They are all lacking in many areas.

Roads are a little different - the existing infrastructure local to the Medway Gap needs protecting from more traffic. Eg, limit local housing development and the Lower Thames Crossing,

More important to promote good public transport network to reduce traffic and pollution. Good pedestrian and cycling facilities to promote healthy living

---

**User Response: Text**

These will enhance the local plan so that people can live, work, shop locally.

Roads already very congested so need bus services and improved junctions

Better roads, better trains

Rail and road seems to be a matter for the UK as a whole not local but the other three can be supplied by local authorities at the planning level.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

The reality is most people drive outside of big cities.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Bus services are currently inadequate and expensive. A network of efficient bus routes, especially to schools, will reduce congestion, pollution and CO2 production.

Safe and attractive cycling and pedestrian routes will reduce congestion, pollution and CO2 production and be of benefit to public health and well-being.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Our roads are becoming more and more clogged with resultant adverse emissions and parking is at a premium everywhere in this area.

I believe these should be prioritised as these are the most widely used

Public transport is a joke. Congestion on the roads is horrendous. Any more housing causes greater pressure on both. Therefore housing needs to ensure minimal impact on infrastructure and/or improve roads, rail and buses along the commuter corridors.

Trying to squeeze a bigger junction into a small historic agricultural village like Wateringbury isn't going to work!

Safe transport and cycling

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.



---

**User Response: Text**

Bus Services Plaxtol has no public transport other than infrequent buses.

Roads including junction improvements Lack of public transport increases the use of private cars adding to congestion and air pollution.

Rail access and carparking issues including lack of spaces and exorbitant parking fees.

Bus services are vitally important especially for the older  
Roads and pavements need special treatment.

Non-drivers, particularly children and the elderly depend on buses. Elderly people cannot be expected to cycle. Some of us have long complained about the problem of providing level access to both platforms at various rural stations in TMBC. Most still don't have this. For a largely rural area, there are still too many traffic blockages on the roads at peak times, especially the A20, where it goes through areas where some people want most of the houses to be built

Age dictates I may soon lose my driving licence. I will need bus services to hospitals, doctor and dentist, plus safe routes to cycle and walk, free of electric scooters and other dangerous innovations.

Low cost public transport would avoid the use of many private cars

My transport Options are based on typical TMBC villages that are not on the main road system. All my local villages like many on the Borough are on unclassified rural roads.

It is essential that the plans and planners register that: THE MAIN MEANS OF TRANSPORT SUPPORTING LIFE IN THESE VILLAGES ARE CARS, LORRIES AND TRACTORS. So much so that parking is a major problem on narrow village roads. With any new development alleviating this is a benefit to old and new villages and this is much cheaper than building new adopted roads.

BUSES ARE THE OTHER KEY COMPONENT OF A COMPETENT VILLAGE TRANSPORT SYSTEM BUT NO LONGER RUN IN ANY OF THE 4 VILLAGES NEAR ME.

Bus services are essential to villagers who cannot drive or do not own a car. The elderly, the young and the poor are heavily discriminated against without a good bus service.

Bus policy must be changed if this is to be overcome. I support the services being run on a commercial basis but this must be heavily controlled and regulated by KCC. The bus service in my villages failed because they were so unreliable that they were impractical to use. So they were less and less used until they failed. In our case Arriva only wanted the profitable part of our service within the Medway Towns and particularly highly profitable main road services linking the major towns. We have evidence that if the village bus services had been reliable that they would have been profitable albeit not highly profitable. Thus a KCC policy should be in place to enable KCC to bundle highly profitable and less profitable services but critically to put a strong priority on the reliability of less frequent village service to ensure their viability.

Walking distances outside the safe pavements of villages are impractical.

Rural roads are typically the most dangerous in the country mile for mile. Cycling is not a safe option unless there is severe traffic calming is done across rural roads. That is not practical and restricts the proper use of the road.

---

**User Response: Text**

There may well be good options for safe long distant cycle routes to be established linking villages and towns but these must be totally independent from and not reliant on the use of narrow winding lanes often with speeding motorists on. Such cycle routes would be of great value in getting youngsters to school and in widening their horizons with access to youth groups and and sports facililites safely and for proper enjoyment of he wider public.

We don't need improvements to speed up traffic but measures to slow down traffic. The 'rural areas' are no longer tranquil because of the weight of traffic. The council's urban perspective ignores the problems in between urban centres which have become serious. We need to protect our green lanes, the tranquil spaces that improve the health of the more urban spaces. Pedestrians and residents in these areas are ignored. KCC concentrates on driving traffic faster and has nibbled away at the verges so that there is no safe place for pedestrians to go. They are driving up car use.

They make sense!!

The quantity of traffic on some of the local main roads and junctions is a significant concern. We should be looking to enhance local public transport to reduce pollution.

Public transport is not and will not be an option in rural areas.

Bus service - isn't fit for purpose currently.

Cycle routs for a healthy community and a green mode of transport

Roads are continuously breaking up causing potholes to be formed and their are currently some junctions that could be addressed for safety issues, visibility etc

Tonbridge needs an eastern bypass from the A21 to the A26.

Leybourne Way needs dualling now all the development has gone in at the Newsprint site

A228 around Kent Street, Kings Hill needs widening

Blue Bell Hill needs sorting out with Lower Thames Crossing coming onboard

A new slip road is needed off the M26 to link to the A21 (J5) in Sevenoaks to take traffic (and freight traffic) away from Borough Green

Roads because we are clogging up around all major centres, buses to try to reduce congestion and pedestrian

---

**User Response: Text**

infrastructure because it has the potential to reduce congestion while improving health outcomes.

These will be most used by me

Commuting communities are often the least happy. We should focus on having cycle walk networks between and within communities, and quick access to national roads eg motorways.

The lack of decent public transport or ability to cycle safely is a major contributor to so many vehicles on the road. Car numbers cannot reduce without proper services and safety measures in place.

The roads cannot support the volume of traffic around KH.

Our school children frequently need to walk from Mereworth (where the bus stops) up to KH along the A228. This is ridiculously dangerous due to the lack of sufficient pavement and very fast passing traffic.

Bus services being cut is impacting mainly on our school children and pensioners. The increased need to use a car isn't helping the borough's climate change strategy.

as detailed in Q21

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Because I walk, and cars park on the pavement

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Bus services seem to be constantly under threat but are often a lifeline for some people. Pedestrian infrastructure is important especially in areas where people will be walking to local shops/school/work. It will be important to avoid heavy traffic disruption and pollution from increases in traffic on roads so the road network must be developed in line with population increases.

In general I believe that rail connections are already good and so developments here are less of a priority

---

**User Response: Text**

Realism, and affordability , i.e. immediate need.

Clearly in future planning all are important with strong consideration for pollution.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Walking and cycling isn't always an option, particularly for the elderly population and disabled therefore good bus routes and roads are essential to maximise the benefits to all citizens of the borough in getting around without causing too much damage regarding climate change.

I have personally experienced the despair that the lack of public transport in my area has caused to my community.

If there were decent bus services running at convenient times it would enable people to make a choice between using public transport or their cars; currently the bus service does not enable this.

Pedestrian infrastructure - to enable people to access services, shops etc safely avoiding main artery roads.

Roads - the state of the roads in TMBC is absolutely appalling both in the state of roads and the amount of traffic using them. The proposed relief road for Borough Green is not a relief road, it will be a spinal road from which residential roads will spring. What is needed is a slip road at junction 5 of the M25 to take traffic away from the A25 through Wrotham, Borough Green, Ightham, Seal, Sevenoaks and Riverhead.

More, funded public transport option have to be an increased part of the mix.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Most journeys are local. Encouraging these journals to be made by bus, bike or foot will improve health, reduce

---

**User Response: Text**

congestion, and decrease climate change emissions.

Making bus travel attractive will require a reduction in fares.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

All are important, but without maintaining and improving transport links, routes and access to transport hubs in all categories, not one of the NPPF 14 objectives will met.

Transport challenges of today the local plan recognises; 2 of 4 TM Borough congestion hotspots are located within the Medway Gap and Medway Valley (A229 and A298), without improved road infrastructure the additional development (domestic housing, mixed use and or industrial / employment opportunities) proposed will increase congestion and reduce other important objectives of NPPF objectives, for example environmental and social well being.

Within the local plan document there is no mention of the impact that the Lower Thames Crossing will have on major and minor roads within the Medway Gap and Valley. National Highways have already stated that A229 and A228 traffic volume will increase between the M2 and M20 junctions which are always congestion hot spots. Both motorways are the primary routes either side of the Medway Gap and Valley and are a key part of the transport plan and developer assumptions to keep local traffic moving without addition congestion.

I think it is incredibly important for our health as well as for mitigating climate change that we should reduce car dependency

If the Kings Hill Rail routes were improved and faster to destinations across Kent and regular bus transport from the station to Kings Hill to match the train timetable the %of people using cars to commute would reduce and the space needed for car parking would also improve.

The current road and rail network in Kent is not currently fit for purpose. Public transport is inadequate and as a result many people have to commute to work by car on already heavily congested roads. For example, if you live in Wateringbury and work in Chatham, the only realistic way to commute is by car. It is simply impossible to widen every road to cope with the current housing targets.

It is currently very dangerous to attempt to walk or cycle on the A228 close to our home, because the road is a single carriageway and the traffic is heavy with high numbers of large lorries heading to Paddock Wood. There are very few buses. Therefore the car becomes the only viable means of transport. Improving cycle routes and pavements would encourage more cycling and walking. The roads in the local area are severely congested during rush hours, meaning that it can take 5-10 minutes to exit our estate. Today ( 20th October) the roads were totally gridlocked for several hours in the morning.

---

**User Response: Text**

Both TMBC and Kent CC have declared a climate emergency. The Local Plan has to respond to this through the allocation of sites for housing and economic development in the most sustainable locations, where connections to existing non-car transport is both possible and viable.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Because the last 2 are covered by the 1st 3. We have good rail facilities, so improving cycle routes & pedestrian infrastructure should improve access to these. For safe cycling & walking many road junctions should be improved, although, the improvements suggested here, are more directed to improve access to reduce congestion. We must improve the bus services, especially in rural areas; make the services affordable & frequent so encouraging residents to use them rather than a car journey. Somehow, we need to encourage the use of local bus services, it seems strange despite the cost of vehicles, fuel, maintenance and parking charges buses can be relatively expensive: - a family of 4 from Burham to Maidstone return @ £6.60 each is £26.40!

Would it be so wrong to allow congestion to the point it deters residents from using their vehicles & adopting the use of public transport? BUT affordable public transport has to be available 1st.

The current road network is already at capacity or beyond at peak periods in many places across the Borough

Not living in a major urban centre means travelling by the most efficient and safest transport currently available which is by car. Bus and rail services are currently too haphazard and don't necessarily serve my needs.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

The roads of West Malling are currently struggling with the volume of traffic. More housing in the wrong areas will put more pressure on established roads. Currently, West Street is a bottle neck and cannot be altered to accommodate more traffic. This street is en route to the local primary school and more houses would naturally contribute more traffic to said school.

Offham Road is a very busy link from Kings Hill and Offham into and through West Malling. Vehicles travel very fast at times - there are many parked cars on the road making it dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services (hybrid buses or

---

**User Response: Text**

fully electric) will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Using cars less. However building more houses results in more traffic which will make it more dangerous to walk/bike.

The main cause of the congestion is too many vehicles on small roads inappropriate for their use. For example, the congestion through tonbridge town centre is largely due to the quantity of oriole getting too and from south tonbridge where the secondary schools and train stations are located. There are only two small roads that lead from north to south tonbridge, if there were more the congestion would decrease. Bus routes are not an option for many of these commuters as they travel from rural, unconnected areas.

The roads will get busier and cycling is eco-friendly and affordable. Walking needs to be prioritised in high density neighbourhoods.

Road safety, health issues. Improved cycle routes would encourage kids to get to school by bike and adults to commute into town or to the station.

There needs to be public transport for communities. A lot of roads have no pavements and can be dangerous to walk along .

Improving bus services locally with road improvements will assist in reducing the demand for car movements and increased traffic.

It is not as if we manufacture the cars to the benefit of this country's economy, and the outdated model whereby every home needs several cars to support the manufacturing industry needs to change, so improve the local bus service and connectivity.

I rarely use public transport - good roads which are not being constantly dug up is what I want

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services (hybrid buses or fully electric) will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

---

**User Response: Text**

We should encourage greener modes of transport, whilst recognising that the appetite for car use is not going to diminish any time soon.

Public transport must be supported to encourage residents to leave their cars at home and for those with no private transport.

The current roads are in an appalling state of repair. There is no funding for a relief road for BG Garden City which will generate any thousands of vehicle movements a day. Plus, the effect on the air quality, which will be made much worse.

Children depend on buses to get to schools and elderly people depend on buses if they cannot drive. Better bus and trains will help relieve congestion on the roads and address climate change

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Because it's dangerous to walk where I live.

Because any short term work on the A25 the arterial road to transport links becomes a car park.

You will not improve air quality or contribute positively to climate change issues unless you get this right, Improve quality and reliability of these services and cycle routes if you want to reduce more road infrastructure, congestion, pollution etc to get cars off the road.

Once improved, the growth in popularity of public transport will look after itself

Buses are poor. East Peckham needs to be better connected to local towns.

There is no safe way to walk to the nearest station (Beltring). Need to be able to park.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

See answer to question 22

Living in Ightham, the pedestrian infrastructure is unsafe/non existent along many roads. Any housing



---

**User Response: Text**

development in Ightham would require significant improvements for pedestrian safety.

Roads to Sevenoaks, Borough Green and Tonbridge, struggle with existing vehicle capacity at peak times. Further housing development would create chaos.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

All the transport issues are important

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

There is a huge opportunity to increase the number of cycle journeys locally if proper infrastructure is provided and existing cycle lanes are connected to enable journeys.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

At present there are no safe pedestrian/cycle routes linking the larger villages of Hadlow and East Peckham with Tonbridge.

More than two roads from the proposed site is required with Hadlow road made more free flowing.

These are our usual methods are transport. Sufficient and affordable car parks are also required at transport hubs.

Rail use is down by 25% post Covid. That means more people at home but also more road traffic.

---

**User Response: Text**

cheaper and more regular bus service MAY help reduce this

Dangerous junction Noble Tree Road and Ring Hill

No disabled access at Hildenborough Station

All important - have simply given higher priority to 3

Walking

Parking

Because I walk, and cars park on the b\*\*\*y pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments

Roads because I drive, cycle routes because I would cycle more if I felt safe, and buses as I would use in preference to using the car if the service was in any way useable which it's not.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

I would also add roads, they are woefully inadequate in this area. Today (20/10/22) the whole area from the bypass /Wateringbury?Mereworth/Kings Hill were gridlocked for several hours because of an road accident in and around Mereworth area and then by the sudden onslaught of very heavy rain, causing amor flooding across this area, hence, stopping people trying to get to their work and children trying to get to school on time. It does not take much for this situation to happen and it is disastrous for everyone.

Roads are a joke in this area - no forward planning

---

**User Response: Text**

Eccles road and many surrounding areas roads have become much busier since the St Peters Bridge was built. The roads/lanes are just not sufficient for the traffic, which speeds along the roads. Further development will only cause further issues.

For a better environment and good mobility.

In the cost of living crisis people ineffective bus services cannot continue to be subsidised. I understand the climate implications. Villages need to grow from an environmental efficiency perspective. No one cycles (we do, but girls think it's deemed "embarrassing") - cycle routes are expensive without much use. Rest is important

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

The roads tend to be very busy and fast and inherently unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians. This is compounded by there being no safe alternatives for cyclists and pedestrians. Thus roads and cycle & pedestrian infrastructure need to be completely re-thought to provide a network of ultra-safe routes for cyclists & pedestrians, with total segregation from vehicle traffic throughout the borough.

Roads are very limiting within West Malling. Any development in or close to it needs to be small so as not to overwhelm the roads, West Street being an example

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Encouraging people to leave their cars at home can only be good for the community and the environment. Improving bus services and pedestrian infrastructure is important. Improving roads/road junctions is of importance so that what traffic is on the roads can move freely. Standing traffic serves only to pollute the environment.

Improve road travel and health and climate change

A junction at M25 Junction 5 westbound is crucial for getting through traffic out of smaller A and B roads and onto more efficient larger roads and motorways. More through traffic must be taken off of smaller roads and onto

---

**User Response: Text**

larger roads. This will lead to a better environment for residents and fewer emissions as journeys are more efficient.

Bus services are poor, thus they do not encourage people out of their cars as the frequency of buses is too low.

Too many country roads lack safe pavement access.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Road safety, health and climate change issues

Focusing on safe routes for children whether by foot or by bike would have a major impact in relieving traffic congestion in peak travel hours. You just have to compare travelling in school holidays with term times to see the difference it would make.

Road safety and health issues

It is inappropriate to limit this to three options as all five are critical. Lack of investment in these areas, and allowing developments which do not meet design guidelines (e.g. in Kings Hill, shared pedestrian/cycle routes only two metres wide) is ridiculous.

Inappropriate to limit to three options when all are crucial and relevant. I wanted to tick all five not be limited to three. Up to now there has been inadequate investment in the area of Kings Hill for all of these

New developments should facilitate ease of movement for new occupants for work and recreation purposes. Focus should therefore be on areas where good transport facilities already exist or can be introduced without major upheaval. I would have ticked all 5 if allowed.

I select all of them as I believe they are all equally important!

Particular emphasis has to be given to the current severe limitations on all roads in the area to cope with the proposed development of up to 16,000 houses - most of which will be large (4-5 bedrooms) and thus have multiple vehicles.

---

**User Response: Text**

Ensuring adequate road infrastructure to support existing and natural development in the borough and surrounding boroughs and wider, to support pass through traffic, but importantly to ensure simple safe and accessible transport for an assumed increase in a modern population that desires these priorities, together with affordable housing and quick / easy access to local amenities, shopping, services and public transport.

These are the greenest and most sustainable.

Roads in West Malling are not equipped to deal with more traffic.

Offham road is largely residential and increased traffic would result in serious road safety issues for children who live on there.

Offham road connects to the high street via West Street, there are listed buildings there and the road cannot be widened to accommodate more traffic. Already, traffic backs up as two-way traffic tries to pass through an intersection that is only wide enough for one car.

Given that pedestrians are the most vulnerable road users, improved crossing points are needed.

When did it become okay for vehicles to be fully parked on pavements and at junctions?

Sustainable transport options need to be prioritised, we need to see a shift over time to moving people out of private cars and into high quality public transport and active transport. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits and behaviour change in the local population.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

I cycle to work and am aware of the difficulties I cause to motorists

buses should be replaced by shared service vehicles with out specified routes but using the internet to coordinate and deliver services efficiently and timely.

We need to reduce car use. Improving roads has historically given a limited advantage, and that only briefly: the easier it is to drive, the more and further people drive, very soon negating any improvement.

I think we already have good enough pedestrian and rail links in Tonbridge.

Living on the outskirts of Tonbridge and as a new, non-confident cyclist, I would love to have better cycling infrastructure. I was inspired to start cycling this year due to moving next to Brook Street which does have a good cycle path. But after that I have to get off and push the bike as the roads are intimidating. Also drivers are

---

**User Response: Text**

constantly flouting the highway code. I would like to be able to cycle to the supermarket by a direct route without getting off my bike.

Re buses, see my comments above. As a non-driver, I always think I should take the bus more. But there are barriers to entry in lack of information easily available to help you plan your journey, plus expense. There is a bus stop outside my house from which I could take a bus into town in a few minutes. However, I choose to walk for 20-25 mins as I can't justify the cost.

Bus services are extremely poor in semi rural areas like Borough Green. New developments also do not provide enough space for parking which results in roads crammed full of cars, often parked on the pavement. I understand the justification for this is to discourage people from having cars but this does not work because people need cars (due in part to poor public transport - but even with improved transport people will always need cars) and so just results in massively congested narrow streets (look at Kings Hill!). Walking primary school aged children to school can be a dangerous experience especially when you have to push a pushchair into the road because of cars parked on the pavement.

Car use only ever gets worse and more polluting. Any alternative to car use should be prioritised.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

All of the above

use all those services

Many roads West Malling are unsuitable for development because of access. West Street into the High Street cannot be widened and is place of constant manoeuvring for vehicles to pass. The flow of traffic is already high and further development on the suggested Fartherwell Road would make this junction an intolerable area of traffic congestion and danger for pedestrians and vehicles. Fartherwell Road is a single carriageway, Quiet Lane, which is also liable to flooding at various parts.

In assessing the feasibility of potential sites it is important that the local plan takes into consideration any development limitations due to road access. A good example of this is West Street in West Malling that cannot be widened to accommodate new infrastructure. In addition public transport access from West Malling to key shopping/entertainment areas both inside the borough (Tonbridge) and outside the borough (Sevenoaks, Tonbridge wells) are woefully poor.

Living in Ightham the pedestrian infrastructure is unsafe/non existent along many roads. Any housing

---

**User Response: Text**

development in Ightham would require significant improvements for pedestrian safety.

Roads to Sevenoaks, Borough Green and Tonbridge, struggle with existing vehicle capacity at peak times. Further housing development would create chaos.

Encourage cars off the roads with better local transport in the first place, it will help with congestion which is a nightmare in Tonbridge at peak times and help with the environment too.

Efficient bus services are a must for climate change reasons. Road safety and benefits to health for pedestrians are also very important. Cars will be with us for ever so improvements in road repair and junctions are also needed.

Specifically for our area i.e. Offham Road, West Malling (sites 59645, 59699, 59714, 59716) access is extremely restricted at the town centre end i.e. West Street which is a single carriageway, Norman Road is always restricted to one lane due to the parking and although the Teston Road end of the Offham Road has two lanes the sight lines are restricted and there is no pavement. In addition, there are stables adjacent to and bridle ways off the Offham Road so there are horses frequently using this section. Much of the Offham Road is de-restricted and is extremely dangerous at present without additional vehicles. The adjacent road (Fartherwell Road) is not only a Quiet Lane but is single carriageway for its entire length so totally unsuitable for additional traffic.

Bus service are inadequate at the moment. Where they get too intermittent, people stop using them altogether. Cycling should be encouraged especially now there are e-bikes to add to the options and its vital that cycling is safe as they are very vulnerable on roads from vehicles. Congestion on roads needs to be improved to deal with the existing hotspots and new ones arising from the new housing now and in the future.

A good bus service that links rural areas to larger towns and railway stations for onward travel would help reduce the number of cars on our already busy roads.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

North Kent is already a brutal network of busy roads and motorways - think of peoples walks in the countryside and commutes to local train stations.

The proposed sites at Snodland and Aylesford North, Burham, Peters Village and Wouldham are served by a

---

**User Response: Text**

substandard Trainline called The Medway Valley Line... it is not fit for purpose now, let along for the future.

Road safety, health issues.

A large increase in cover and frequency of bus services is needed and will show a demonstrable benefit for climate change.

The ethos of sustainability is underpinned by the need to travel by modes other than the motor car. Enhancing the provision of public transport and improving walking and cycling routes must be a priority for the Council in order to provide the opportunities for this to be a natural choice for people. If not, people will continue to rely on the motor car which goes against the grain of sustainable development.

To reduce use of cars

For the older generation a safe walking environment is essential. Increased traffic is not welcomed.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

The provision of an exit slip road from the M26 in Sevenoaks is long overdue and would take a lot of rush-hour traffic off the A25 through Borough Green, Ightham and Seal.

Many of the country roads lack safe pavements. A junction at M25 Junction 5 westbound will make journeys more efficient and less polluting and get traffic off of the roads in the local areas. Too many huge HGVs go on small back roads and through little villages.

We don't have a railway station and the roads are a joke.

These would help remove cars from the roads, helping with global warming.

Bus services are for many the only realistic alternative to the car. Quicker car journeys mean less pollution. Walking particularly important for schools.



---

**User Response: Text**

These issues currently impact on Village residents access including the vulnerable such as the elderly, disabled and children's safety.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

We need cycle routes in the area. We need roads with good wide cycle lanes. In towns and railway stations we need safe lock ups for our bikes. We need to improve station access and links with cycling and walking routes. We need cheap bus services that link up with services and places. IE Train Stations and sporting facilities.

They are all low-carbon means of travel. I would add rail to the list. We must move away from car-dominated communities. Look at any residential road: Cars everywhere. We must link the use of public transport to incentives, subsidies and undertake social marketing of green travel modes. School children living within 10k of the school should be able to cycle on dedicated, seamless paths.

repeated from 22 0 buses are key with experimental funding models and shuttle bus type options (eg to get to stations) hilly borough means cycling to get to local amenities is not always practical. Good safe places to leave bikes if on train (eg electric bikes could avoid car use in hilly areas but need safe place to leave them) - shared ownership systems (eg for electric bikes)

Transport must meet the needs of all users and age groups and economic status

Motorway junctions need to be improved

To encourage residents to keep cars off the roads

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

---

**User Response: Text**

Improve road travel. Buses have now been cut by KCC.

Rail travel-8 coaches only from Borough Green

Improving bus and cycle routes are positive for green transport. I would like to add pedestrian infrastructure but I have to be realistic and prioritise road improvements first as some junctions are already causing major problems which the Local Plan will only exacerbate.

The road in Wateringbury is a prime example of pollution and the councils inability to do anything about a major health hazard.

They are mostly all important rather than nice to have.

We need to try, as far as possible, to move drivers towards their legs and bikes.

We also need to get Ebbsfleet and Ashford up and running again.

Better Pathways along main and semi-rural roads would enable to people to be more independent, e.g getting to and from school and colleges, particularly Hadlow, reducing car traffic.

Safer cycle routes to encourage more people to cycle and reduce car traffic congestion

Bus services to include accessibilty to people with disabilities.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

I have highlighted trains but not for the reason you outline. I consider trains expensive and frankly, the service no better than it was when the government owned them. The dividends paid to shareholders should be used to reduce the cost of travel to encourage more people to use them.

---

**User Response: Text**

Roads as we are all clogged up around all major centres. Buses help but also gets clogged up and they tend only to be on main roads for economic reasons. Pedestrian infrastructure has potential to improve health ( but not on main roads because of exhaust fumes ).

Increased Pollution has to be a serious consideration on any developments within Hadlow where close to A26.

Many roads completely clogged up, bus services expensive and not regular to warrant using over car. Public transport key factor in reducing global warming

5.5.22 mentions traffic hotspot “around Tonbridge town centre”. This presumably refers to the main feeder roads into town, like A26 Hadlow Road, Shipbourne Road. Further additions of significant numbers of homes in Tonbridge will exacerbate these existing traffic problems.

The likely effects of the Tunbridge Wells BC development plan for Capel/Tudely have been omitted. Should this plan proceed a further very heavy traffic burden will be placed on Three Elm Lane/Hadlow Road junction and the A26 into Tonbridge as residents on the new development cut across country using this route.

Our principal methods of travel are walking, private car and bus - no longer cycle and do not use rail services frequently.

Health issues pollution

No response

Safety and health

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus service will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

WE need to get away from the car for many reasons not least pollution.

They are the areas most frequently used, but bus services and train services are very important to many living in the area.

If the aim is to minimise car journeys, then alternatives to car transport are required and new housing needs to be

---

**User Response: Text**

located where these options are available. Experience shows buses are not a viable alternative. Their routes are too limited, operational hours too restricted, operation too costly without subsidy and they are net polluters compared even with cars. Safe cycle routes are a green alternative, but narrow lanes and busy A roads have too high traffic flows to make cycling safe. A trunk network of purpose designed designated cycle routes is required to link the key rail heads for commuting. Improved pedestrian links are key, especially within 400m of new housing developments. New housing needs to be within 400m of services and transport hubs, with safe footways and crossings, if it is to enable people to leave behind their cars. Too many proposed sites are isolated from established centres, up narrow lanes without separate footway access.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Answered under question 22

Bus services are expensive and do not run on time. The buses are old stock, dirty and not environmentally friendly. The drivers could be a bit happier too! Also why does London give free fares at 60 but we have to wait until we are 66 down here? We need Oyster cards please with a daily cap. And a bus service from Larkfield to West Malling Station and a proper bus service to Maidstone Hospital which runs more than once an hour

Walking and Parking are the most important issues.

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

Bus services should be protected and enhanced not cut as we so often hear. Local roads are already congested at peak times of the day so this should be a major consideration when choosing sites. Roads may need improving but not at the expense of the landscape.

Children and the elderly depend on the busses for school and shopping also better buses and trains would reduce congestion helping the climate

Smaller frequent buses could encourage more usage. Linked with the good rail service in this area this could be a powerful solution.

---

**User Response: Text**

I do not believe you will stop people using their cars and I know you all think cycle usage is the answer to the transport issues. I disagree as I have said many times

bus important for children and is poor at the moment, roads for safety improvements needed and safer zones for walking needed

If we want to realistically encourage more people to get out of the cars and use public transport, walk and cycle more, then these facilities must be developed properly.

Improve road travel, health, climate change

No response

As set out in our response to question 11 CPRE Kent is of the view that the right housing should be provided in the right places – it should be sustainably located. And in terms of sustainability (and the issues of addressing climate change) that road-building is failing to provide the congestion relief and economic boost promised while devastating the environment as set out in research commissioned by CPRE (<https://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/the-end-of-the-road-challenging-the-road-building-consensus/>)

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.

The Council should be aiming for 20% biodiversity. The State of Nature in Kent report (July 2022) <https://kentnature.org.uk/state-of-nature/> (funded by LWT, KCC and KPOG) sets out how we need to recognise that nature is vital for a happy, healthy society. How it reduces pollution and flooding and supports adaptation to climate change – including locking up carbon. How every effort needs to be taken to ensure no further loss or deterioration of key habitats. How bigger landscape-scale projects need to be delivered to join-up fragmented habitats and secure more land in conservation management - in order to help deliver an ambitious Nature Recovery Network, as enshrined in the new Environment Act.

I am visually impaired and rarely venture out after dark. Virtually no bus service and one train an hour. Pavements cluttered with various signs from cafes and shops plus tables and chairs on pavements

I live in Borough Green so there is a lot of passing through traffic from the motorway due to the mistake with junctions

If new developments include new services and are located in proximity to existing urban areas with such services, then there is little need for additional bus or rail services to accommodate transport demand. More urban development will require improved cycle and pedestrian infrastructure as it should be a priority to reduce the need

---

**User Response: Text**

for car use for journeys to local shops and services and schools. Inevitably there will be pressure on roads and therefore perfecting road networks and junctions to ensure a smooth flow of traffic through urban centres will be a priority.

They are already lacking in some areas so need to be looked at as a priority.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Best support sustainability/net zero.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

to reduce carbon emissions

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Borough green is already contested at certain times of day and the traffic going through Borough Green on the main road is dangerous. Even more traffic will make it a nightmare.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

There is a huge opportunity to increase the number of cycle journeys locally if proper infrastructure is provided and existing cycle lanes are connected to enable journeys.

These are the methods of transport I use the most. Rail and pedestrian infrastructure need improvement with more accessible stations and increased train journeys and links. It wouldn't let me tick a 4th box, but bus services are in dire need of improvement as well, since the last time I got on a bus in Kent to school, there was a good chance it wouldn't turn up at all. Compared to the buses in Colchester (somehow First buses are better than Arriva) the bus services in and around the Maidstone/Tonbridge and Malling areas are a disgrace.

---

**User Response: Text**

None of the questions above have ever bothered tmbc before so what will change their way of dealing with issues raised about new proposed areas

need to reduce reliance on car traffic

Rail use is down 25% post Covid. That equates to potentially more localised traffic during the day.

Cheaper and more regular local public transport MAY alleviate this issue.

Affordable local transport and safe cycle routes are among the most effective means of reducing road traffic and climate change impact.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

These will have health and climate advantages.

Need to get people out of cars and onto public transport and walking and cycling more. But to do this public transport has to be improved and train service capacity particularly in the NE of the borough.

TMBC have classed Kings Hill as a urban area but has very poor public transport links, the station is just too far to walk on a regular basis. There are too few bike lockers and the buses are infrequent and expensive. It is perfect for an electric bike hire scheme between West Malling station and Kings Hill.

no comment

Roads because we are clogging up around all major centres, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure because they have the potential to reduce congestion while improving health outcomes.

The environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need to lower CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behavioural change in the local population.

Pedestrian infrastructure - safety should always be a priority. Speeding through Wateringbury (particularly down Bow Road and the A26 from Maidstone) is terrible and therefore additional pedestrian / safety infrastructure would be of benefit.

Roads - pot holes, parking issues, speeding, traffic light control could all be improved could help with traffic flow and safety of all road users and pedestrians.

Road safety and health issues. However, only a substantial increase in cover and frequency and reduction in cost will persuade less car usage and therefore lead to demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues.

With the increase in inhabitants, trains and buses will be getting more and more overcrowded.

We need better bus routes so people don't use their cars so much, but better roads too. Safe walking routes are beneficial to health and wellbeing.

Bus services are essential in serving those who cannot drive, cycle or walk extended distances. Bus, cycle and footpaths reduce parking demand at rail stations. Pedestrian paths, cycling, mobility scooters are most effective where travel distances are relatively short and the Highway Code gives priority over cars. Rural areas / Lanes attract cycling and walking enthusiasts and for safety development should mitigate against increasing motorised traffic flows in rural areas.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

These seem to be the most heavily utilised methods of transport and should therefore be prioritised

Roads need improving to account for the increased capacity. They cannot cope now - let alone with more housing.



---

**User Response: Text**

Bus services are essential for children to get to school and for reducing car dependence. It can improve air quality and reduce CO2 emissions by reducing individual car use. 2. At present we do not have good public transport but we do have massive queuing at road junctions around Wrotham. Idling vehicles causes pollution and poor air quality.

Children and the elderly depend on the busses for school and shopping also better buses and trains would reduce congestion helping the climate.

Children and the elderly depend on the busses for school and shopping also better buses and trains would reduce congestion helping the climate

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Buses don't run at the right times, or frequency, for schools or commuters from rural settlements.

Rural lanes without pavements or streetlights are dangerous for pedestrians.

Junctions from 'A' Roads onto side roads / lanes are notoriously dangerous and often result in accidents.

For health and well being of individuals and the planet

The reality of country life is that it is dominated by the car, so any improvements to alleviate road congestion, either by improving buses or road infrastructure in needed.

The roads including junctions do need improving where necessary but cycling, pedestrians and bus services matter more and should be strong priorities as they are more specific and relevant to climate change.

---

### User Response: Text

**Bus/Roads** - The A26 crossroads & narrow roads at Watlingbury connecting Nettlestead, Yalding, Mereworth, Pizen Well Teston & East Malling is already problematic & cannot easily be resolved without significantly detrimentally affecting these villages some of which contain Conservation areas.

Any development along the A26 in & adjacent these villages is inappropriate when specifically considering this narrow A26 corridor & historical individual nature, character & Grade 1 Agricultural land within this areas of the beautiful Medway Valley.

Buses need to be regular & predictable to ensure people get to School/appointments/work on time - which is not possible if roads become congested.

There are other pinchpoints that should be prioritised such as the Cannon Lane area of Tonbridge from the A26 traffic lights to the Royal Mail Building & roads towards the A21 from the centre of Tonbridge - when these snarl up these become disincentives to travel to Tonbridge.

**Cycling** - There are many opportunities within the along the A26 within the Medway Valley to cycle on relatively quiet roads and off road areas to get between villages & Kings Hill. Additional development will increase traffic on these routes affecting safe use & pollution as less people then choose not to cycle.

The green corridors between these villages is important to maintain the identity, community & character of these individual villages.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Rural buses do not run at viable times or frequency for commuters or school children.

Rural lanes without pavements and street lights are dangerous for pedestrians. Electric cars being quieter will increase the danger.

junctions from A roads into side roads which are country lanes are notoriously dangerous and often result in accidents

Improved bus services and pedestrian routes will encourage walking and use of public transport, which would both reduce congestion.

It is inevitable that many of us, including my household, will continue to need to travel by car/work van for journeys which would be impossible or excessively time consuming to take on public transport. Tonbridge has good access to the road network, part of our reason for living here, and that should remain a consideration.

I think we need to look at the most sustainable methods of transport, ideally reducing the distance that people have to travel in order to work and gain access to services

---

**User Response: Text**

I am not a bus user. Roads are difficult especially rural ones. e.g. Wateringbury Road which is a rat run and oer used a danger to all. pedestrians use the roads at their peril.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change beneSts, and behaviour change in the local population.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change beneSts, and behaviour change in the local population.

Cycling is the least developed with poor interconnecting routes. For instance there is not a safe (by Dutch standards) cycle route along the Medway valley from Tonbridge to Maidstone connecting the communities. We built the footpath but not the adjacent cycleway. The link from Kings Hill to Maidstone has stalled. In many cases there are large verges which could have cycle ways provided. This needs a radical investment. A Borough cycling strategy would facilitate growth, health and school access.

A strategic approach to a county wide bus provision under a single elected official should be tabled and considered. At present, the private provision is not working. We need to learn from the London mayor effect on transport there. Affordable bus access for children, the elderly and low paid workers would assist growth

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change beneSts, and behaviour change in the local population.

I use the 3 above most

Buses are a lifeline for older residents within our more rural areas and whilst the bus services may not be of a required financial level they are never the less essential to the welfare of older residents and this matter should be taken into consideration when appraising new sites.

Parking is also a problem even on the new sites which have been recently, and still are, being built due to a lack of design of the building sites ie garages/car ports being not built adjacent to the respective properties. This also affects pedestrian infrastructure where pedestrians some with pushchairs and children are forced into the road by cars parking on the pavement.

---

**User Response: Text**

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

The road infrastructure along the A26 and between the A26 A20 and M20 are poor, they are often struggling to cope with the current demands let alone those imposed by the proposed applications particularly along the A26 between Maidstone and Tonbridge

For obvious reasons.

Limited bus, rail and taxi services in the area make it difficult to access without a car.

Bus services are completely limited and improvement should be made a priority.

The services highlighted are all essential to health and wellbeing as well as achieving a zero carbon environment. Accessibility to rail services is important but secondary to the others. However, the quality and efficiency of those services is important albeit outside the local plan remit

A good bus and rail service is essential for rural communities and will reduce road traffic which in turn will reduce pollution and therefore climate change. There needs to be a new slip road built at Junction 5 of the M25 as this will reduce the traffic and therefore the pollution and road traffic noise that currently blights Borough Green and surrounding area. The pavements are very limited and in Borough Green village the pavements are very narrow and many times I've come close to being hit by cars and lorries driving far to close the pavement. In addition we have problems of people parking on pavements making it impossible or very difficult to walk past especially for those with disabilities or with children.

Again, all matter and more houses will make all of those things even more stretched. As a commuter to London, the trains cannot cope with more.

Bus services are essential for children to get to school and for reducing car dependence. It can improve air quality and reduce CO2 emissions by reducing individual car use.

At present we do not have good public transport but we do have massive queuing at road junctions around Wrotham. Idling vehicles causes pollution and poor air quality.

---

**User Response: Text**

Transport must meet the needs of all age groups and those of different economic levels.

If the motorway junctions in TMBC are not improved, then there will be more chaos on the roads and communities will be subjected to rat running.

Area I live in is dominated by roads which are difficult/impossible to use as pedestrians or cyclists because the traffic is too fast and the road too narrow (e.g. B2016 Seven Mile Lane and A228 Malling Road). There is already far too much traffic on these two roads and if one is blocked with an accident or breakdown there is congestion back to the M20.

I am concerned about the Potential impact of the development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at CAPEL ,as to the extra traffic this would generate in the surrounding Neighbourhoods including East Peckham.

East Peckham needs better bus services.

the local roads cannot cope with an increase of traffic

A better safer pedestrian access to the railway would help to minimise traffic on the road , although no station is of a walkable distance for

many east peckham residents.

- East Peckham needs better bus services
- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic
- Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

Road safety ,health issues . Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits .

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road

---

**User Response: Text**

safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Bus services will become more flexible accommodating shared ownership of vehicles and interaction with taxi services.

bus services are vital for children getting to school and not needing parents to add to the rush hour commuting their children to and from school.

the roads are in a poor condition and are frequently undergoing repairs which causes more problems.

Unfortunately given the greenbelt and flooding issues historically the roads have not been designed for the current level of traffic

See previous response regarding the train line. Potholes galore in this Borough.

you don't have a good track record of active travel infrastructure, yet. Maybe this is the catalyst for you to put some good schemes in place

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and attitudinal and behaviour change in the local population. A huge amount of additional traffic is caused in Tonbridge & Malling by the Grammar School system, that means that children are more likely to travel long distances to their desired school - sustainable methods of transport that are safe and accessible to children from a young age will result in a significant reduction in unnecessary car journeys in and around the Borough.

I do not use bus facilities therefore not so important to me personally. I would have chosen cycling but ran out of options!

If we are to ever going to cut down on our reliance on the car to make even the shortest journeys and, by doing so, cut down on harmful emissions there must be improvement in bus services and the provision of dedicated cycle routes to the nearest retail / recreational hubs and train stations.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

---

**User Response: Text**

East Peckham needs better bus services.

Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.

Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

? Bus services.

? Roads including junction improvements.

? Rail – improving station access and links with cycling and walking routes.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

? East Peckham needs better bus services.

? Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.

? Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

Important to prioritise affordable public transport to reduce traffic on roads

minimise car usage

See above

This is the one and only area that needs to be seriously addressed.

Pedestrian and cycle routes are already well catered for.

---

**User Response: Text**

Walking can be dangerous as there are large lorries using the local roads and cars park on the already narrow pavements because new developments do not allow enough space for parking cars.

We have to make meaningful change to how we live if we are going to tackle climate change before it is too late.

Bus services are the life blood for rural communities - otherwise they stagnate and die.

Pedestrian infrastructure and Roads are key safety issues.

Bus services are poor or non-existent in most places and providing better, regular services may encourage people to use them. Most journeys are quite short and it should be easier for people to make those journeys by bike or on foot.

The least obtrusive.

because these are problems we have in our village

In and around West Malling all the surrounding roads and lanes are totally inadequate to cope with any more traffic. Swan Street, Luck's Hill, Fartherwell Avenue, Offham Road, Norman Road and West Street are heavily parked and exceptionally busy as they are used by school and village hall traffic. Teston Road is used extensively by traffic from King's Hill as a cut-through, avoiding WM High Street. Fartherwell Lane is a one track country road that is regularly flooded. Sandy Lane has a blind corner under the railway bridge. None of these road networks are suitable for more traffic. To do so would create gridlocks around West Malling and pose a danger to pedestrians, especially to families walking children to school. Cars already mount the pavement in Offham Road, rather than waiting for a gap in traffic.

Getting people out of their cars for every single journey is essential. Walking cycling infrastructure has to be part of this, in particular focussing this on the end destination such as railway station or schools.

Roads need to be safe for all to travel on as most households own more than 1 car, many people also use the roads for cycling too. Improvements for cycle pathways and shared footpaths will ensure everyone has safe environment when travelling.

? East Peckham needs better bus services. ? Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic. ? Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.



---

**User Response: Text**

West Malling Station is now the transport hub for Kings Hill with no improvements in service at all.

Why is this station not upgraded with a more frequent service to work places to accommodate the immense increase in population in this area?

By ignoring this aspect the council are encouraging more and more private cars on the road with the associated pollution etc everyone is so anxious about.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Safe cycle routes and pedestrian infrastructure will provide a route to allow people to improve their fitness and improve their mental health.

Trains are too linear to ever be effective in rural boroughs like ours; we will never have the equivalent of a tube network or large overground rail infrastructure. Buses, roads and cycle routes allow more options for travelling to required destinations.

More opportunities for safe cycle paths and well maintained pedestrian infrastructure.

Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

These because I would like to use my cycle more and would feel safer on segregated cycle ways. I would like to see an encouragement for young people to walk to and from school rather than the motor drop-off that characterises the trip to school for many today. Finally I would like to see an improvement to the junctions around Wrotham that are choked with traffic at peak times today. (It would help if we did not have continuing proposals for traffic intense development proposals in the locality!!)

so people can travel safely, some places have not pavement so walking is not an option,

new access road need to be built not make our already busy roads even more busy - changing junction will not make the roads less busy

rail links into London are essential as this is a main commuter route providing salaries that cannot be found locally.

Local busses as crucial as many smaller villages have nor rail links and people without the use of private cars need affordable means to move around and reach local amenities

---

**User Response: Text**

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will demonstrate climate change benefits.

East Peckham needs better bus routes - the current timings of the buses make taking the bus to Paddock Wood, the closest mainline station with links to London, impossible. The buses from Paddock Wood to East Peckham end too early so travelling by car to Paddock Wood is the only option.

With no secondary school in or near East Peckham, school bus routes are vital and at threat from funding and service cuts.

To help tackle climate change and health issues it is important to make it easier for people to make active and greener travel choices that are safe.

Promote more exercise.

Again, I think you should rank these rather than ask to choose 3 out of 5. Each is of importance but I'd choose these three over the other two but still feel that I'd like a say over buses and cycle routes too. From what I've seen thousands get spent on projects that actually don't do what they are supposed to. Cyclists are still on the road in Hildenborough not on the designated cycle paths and this sort of problem. I just don't see any benefit from these things - it is joined up, it isn't enforced and it makes things worse not better. We need transport that makes things easier not slow things up and isn't thought through.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

---

**User Response: Text**

You need to create bypasses around villages and stop busy A roads going right through. There needs to be a bypass on the A25 around borough Green to reduce the number of lorries passing through this village. This should not be contingent on more housing being built. It is needed now to reduce the traffic, make the roads safer for cyclists and pedestrians and improve air quality for the houses near to the road.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

I think having to select only three is disappointing as railway and bus travel along with good provision for pedestrians and cyclists are all of utmost importance.

an example where I feel current planning is lacking is Cycling infrastructure not only needs to be provided but needs to be of high quality and continuous from planned origin to destination. Current facilities in the Tonbridge area are scattergun and split with little in the way of coherent implementation with an origin and a destination. An example would be an unbroken marked route from a new development to either a local train station or shopping site.

Road conditions in the borough are generally poor with broken surfaces, mis graded utilities covers and regular flooding, these all need consideration when increasing the numbers of cars in an area with a development. Additionally some major routes in the borough appear to run at or beyond capacity and adding additional cars causes problems with usability, condition and pollution which all affect health for people in the borough.

All the above issues are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits and behaviour change in the local population.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy; only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services plus any new housing being built as near to the town centre as possible will change the behaviour of the local population.

Cycling is healthy and less polluting.

---

**User Response: Text**

Buses are good for our predominantly rural community, but they need to be smaller and run more regularly and be electric powered, not diesel.

Frequent bus services would help to relieve congestion on the roads.

The three options chosen should be strong priorities as they are more specific and relevant to climate change. These issues are even more important for rural/village communities.

Offham's only bus service other than for school students is to cease completely in February 2023 following KCC's withdrawal of funding support. The only option is a once a week link by Kent Karrier for those on a very restricted group. This is entirely insufficient for many more elderly residents, but if in place would assist us to discourage use or ownership of private transport.

**All the above** are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Providing safe access for families within the borough.

Roads are already too busy and too narrow for cyclists.

To encourage more people to use public transport and in so doing take cars off the road.

Bus routes supported by a good service, safe and well-designed cycle and pedestrian routes with good air quality are crucial for reducing carbon emissions, congestion and for health and safety. The most important element of use of rail services is the service itself, which is beyond the scope of the Local Plan.

See answer to Q21.

These are already inadequate and need improvement even if no new housing is built

Road safety for cyclists and pedestrians is important and these activities should be encouraged as an alternative to reliance upon motor vehicles. The roads are congested and unsafe.

---

**User Response: Text**

Pedestrian infrastructure - safety should always be a priority. Speeding through Wateringbury (particularly down Bow Road and the A26 from Maidstone) is terrible and therefore additional pedestrian / safety infrastructure would be of benefit.

Roads - pot holes, parking issues, speeding, traffic light control could all be improved could help with traffic flow and safety of all road users and pedestrians.

Young family with children using the majority of these services.

These issues most benefit from the strategic overview of the Local Plan. Roads (and adequate parking) are very hard to assess in isolation of the wider impact across the Borough and therefore seems most appropriate here. Same with rail where the provision of services is actually determined by SouthEastern so even if there is more parking at a station - the trains may remain crowded - the local plan gives SouthEastern a strong evidence base rather than piecemeal plans. Pedestrian influence has to be a priority.

The existing rural bus routes are inadequate. More cycling routes should be put in place - follow the example of London in this regard.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Buses and railways are key matters for the borough especially in Hildenborough as a commuter area. The B245 also needs to be carefully considered as without these 2 facilities, pressure from vehicular movements will increase the congestion on this main artery from Sevenoaks to Tonbridge.

Young family with children using the majority of these services.

Young family with children using the majority of these services.

Improving cycle and pedestrian infrastructure will help reduce climate impact and congestion.

I am concerned about the potential impacts of development within Tunbridge wells Borough Council, in particular, the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas, including East Peckham.

---

**User Response: Text**

East Peckham needs better bus services.

East Peckham needs better bus services.

The roads locally cannot cope with the increased traffic.

better pedestrian access to railways will hopefully help minimise traffic on the roads, although no station is walkable from most residents in East Peckham.

1, A good bus service can potentially take some cars off the road,.

2, SAFE Cycle routes can reduce vehicles on the roads and provide for healthy exercise when off road! Open up footpaths to cycles.

3, Improve upkeep of rural road surfaces for both cars and cycles.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Road safety and health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

I would have chosen the first 4 given the option just NOT improving roads

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Coordinated transport approach is needed focusing on key deliverables.

Motor cars will remain primary modes of transport - there is no viable alternative. INvestment should be made to reduce congestion and major bottlenecks

---

**User Response: Text**

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Need to prevent the increase in traffic through villages and on country lanes.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.  
There is a huge opportunity to increase the number of cycle journeys locally if proper infrastructure is provided and existing cycle lanes are connected to enable journeys.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Wateringbury has clear infrastructure constraint and this is easily proven by the number of times per year we have road closures near the village crossroads. It also has a large amount of roads without pedestrian access. The bus service is very good but has no reasonable links between points, for example Wateringbury to West Malling.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Smooth flow of traffic would result in lower vehicular pollution. Good public services will do likewise.

---

**User Response: Text**

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population and accessible to all to get from A to B safely. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

In Hildenborough, the space given to pedestrians alongside cycle tracks is too little, sometimes derisory and not infrequently overgrown by vegetation which is insufficiently kept in check by the relevant local authority. More of this would not be welcome, nor would a continuation of inadequate signage telling cyclists not to use the paths they should not.

The B245 should have been regarded by Jacobs as a major route, because that is what it is. The frequent congestion at its junction with the A227 (and often for a long way towards it) is a major adverse feature of life in Hildenborough, which further development in and around the Village would make severely worse.

All provide a healthier, environmentally more secure alternative to road improvement. We're a semi-rural community so roads are inevitably a necessity, but that does not mean they have to be a priority

Rail is a vital step to enabling the other three though!

See above answer to question 22. There is currently a minimal bus service in the area with many bus routes being reduced.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Bus services are the only way to reach most secondary schools.

Car dependance needs to reduce.

Major junctions in the locality are congested. Traffic M20-M26 and using local roads with pedestrians and no pavements.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in



---

**User Response: Text**

cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Public transport lowers energy uses and well planned and well laid out roads make for efficient journeys.

All can help to reduce climate change in the long term.

The bus service to allow ease of access for Hildenborough residents to the services of Tonbridge requires improvement. Many people find it more convenient to get into their own vehicle to make the short trip.

The road junctions at Leigh Road and the B245 opposite The Flying Dutchman requires review as does that from the Brookmead estate. The impact of the Powdermills development in Leigh can be seen now due to the increase in traffic naturally coming to use the services of Tonbridge rather than Sevenoaks due to their proximity to it.

In Hildenborough, the space given to pedestrians alongside cycle tracks is too little, sometimes derisory and not infrequently overgrown by vegetation which is insufficiently kept in check by the relevant local authority. More of this would not be welcome, nor would a continuation of inadequate signage telling cyclists not to use the paths they should not.

The B245 should have been regarded by Jacobs as a major route, because that is what it is. The frequent congestion at its junction with the A227 (and often for a long way towards it) is a major adverse feature of life in Hildenborough, which further development in and around the Village would make severely worse.

Public transport e.g. bus, rail, etc. helps to reduce individual car use and thus reduce pollution levels.

New homes lead to higher density areas, thus the pedestrian infrastructure is needed.

The roads in West Malling are unable to cope with the further traffic, particularly west street/high street, these roads cannot be widened

Roads are currently heavily congested leading to rat running through smaller rural settlements such as East Malling

Cycle routes and pedestrian infrastructure need improving

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

---

**User Response: Text**

It's what I believe is required

Encourage the majority of local trips to be taken by more sustainable transport options e.g. walking, bikes and bus.

There are currently many routes that our family take and others in the local area which are unsafe to walk with young children and so, even only down the road, we use our car. For example, Lower Haysden Lane.

We need to address the need for low CO2 emissions and reverse climate change, road safety and promote being active and healthy.

Walking, Parking.

Because I walk, and cars park on the b\*\*\*y pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments

So that people can walk and cycle (evironmentally-friendly and health-friendly options) safely to and from school or work. Roads need continual improvement to accommodate the ever increasing numbers of cars on them. This happens even without news homes being built.

Cycling has benefits for the environment and health. We cannot increase the population without improving already congested road junctions. We need to encourage people to use public transport more and people without cars need to be able to travel to local facilities.

- People should be given better travel options to those currently in place ie, poor bus services to major centres, protected cycle infrastructure and to encourage people to use cars less. Whole infrastructure is car based and should not be.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

We need safe pedestrian and cycle access to station and if belt ring station is to become useful it needs parking and cycle storage.

we also need a proper bus service that is reliable, more frequent and runs later in the evening.

---

**User Response: Text**

In the interests of Climate Change, Health, (both physical & mental) Cleaner Air.

Access and safety are key elements to public transport.

Footpaths, off road and direct through key areas of housing are always safer.

These are the modes of transport I am most likely to use.

To help tackle climate change and health issues it is important to make it easier for people to make active and greener travel choices that are safe.

We should not be encouraging car use

Although I am a motorist I do use buses where convenient. Having been a commuter to London I consider it important to have good train services which are easily accessible and again for some long journeys it is still my preferred mode of transport.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

N/a

Safe and accessible transport options for disabled people should be one of the issues included in all considerations.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

All the services highlighted are important to try and get to zero carbon.

---

**User Response: Text**

The train route into London is already over crowded during rush hour but also very over crowded at the weekends too. We need more trains to handle any new housing in Borough Green. The bus services are practically non existent.

Young family and friends are using it majority of time when traveling to school and other places.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

We all agree that there is a need to encourage people to cycle and walk more, both for their own health but also for the health of the planet. Some of the road junctions in the area are in need of improvement in order to make them safer and we see this as a priority, especially if residents are to be encouraged to walk and cycling more. To achieve this they will want to be assured that the roads and junctions are as safe as possible. We appreciate much of this depends on Kent County Council and their plans.

Would reduce car use within our rural community.

i think we need to move away from reliance on cars but make it safer for people to use bikes.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Make it safe and easy for people to travel without using the car (just imposing 20mph limit does not decrease traffic!). Current cycle routes are too fragmented and therefore not used properly and deter people, including myself and my family, from cycling.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover

---

**User Response: Text**

and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Not enough space is allowed by developers for parking or cycle lanes. The rail companies do not provide the service needed at present without building vast amounts more.

All are important but the bus network desperately needs to be improved so that people are not obliged to use cars.

I use road, rail and walking, and do not have an issue with any (perhaps because I have the luxury of choosing when I move about).

I do not cycle much, and I think I would be persuaded with more bespoke routes. It is, I believe, the way forward.

Buses are essential for elderly access to services. School runs as well. I'm a walker, so improved walking routes would be great

Again, the transport infrastructure is so fragmented in West Kent.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Buses are needed to get children to school and thereby reducing car journeys. Buses get people to the stations, again reducing car journeys. Road junctions around Wrotham (and other local areas) are choked and the delays mean cars are idling and making air pollution.

Our daughter only lives a mile or so from her secondary school, but because of a lack of adequate footpath, she cannot walk and has to use the (very expensive) bus service.

---

**User Response: Text**

Road as it's the most used and gives the most flexibility. Less congestion equals less emissions which improves environmental impact. Cycle route to improve safety and the convenience of cycling in lieu of a car. Rail as the network is good its just how much it costs and how people are getting there.

Where possible, residents should be encouraged away from using their cars to reduce the environmental impact they have if we are to progress towards meeting climate change targets. With the reduction in rural bus routes that have been implemented over the years, I do not see bus services being a viable option. By improving the cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, the Local Plan can encourage more residents to become active whilst also benefiting their well-being.

Bus services are the most important for enabling people to get to work and services within the district; a significant improvement will be required to support extra housing development anywhere outside Tonbridge that does not have a railway station.

Safe pedestrian routes between home and school, and to public transport are essential.

Rail has significant potential for enabling housing and economic development; it is a shame that there are no plans to try to improve services or the number of stations in the district.

Bus services - with the closure of the West Malling surgery it is difficult for older people to get to the other sites (Leybourne and Kings Hill) if they do not have a car. My understanding is that the bus service is limited and the community transport scheme was recently reviewed as it was not profit making. There is a large older community in West Malling and getting out and about is a life line to them and their physical and mental health.

Pedestrian infrastructure - it is important for the environment and people's health that they are able to walk to places safely, rather than risk their safety and/or damage the environment by jumping in their cars to travel short distances.

Road - junction improvements will help to improve the flow of traffic and avoid unnecessary blockages and delays.

There are severe limitations of roads in West Malling to cope with more development, especially West Street which cannot be widened to accommodate new infrastructure to support housing.

Buses are a lifeline for older residents within rural areas and these services should be looked at from a service point of view, not a financial point of view.

Parking is also a problem even on the recently built sites due to a lack of design where garages are not built adjacent to the properties. This means cars park on the pavement in front of their properties and are forcing pedestrians, some with pushchairs and children, into the road by cars parking on the pavement.

Low carbon transport choices must be prioritised. However, we would expect supporting infrastructure for

---

**User Response: Text**

electric and ultra-low emission vehicles to be recognised as a priority (provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles).

See response to Q2

These are the biggest factors that will help achieve net zero given an expansion of housing. They are also two areas that really poorly catered for in Hildenborough.

Safer use of non-motorised travel will improve the air quality for local residents as well as helping TMBC meet climate change priorities. Even where provision has been made (eg A20 from West Malling to Larkfield) this is not safe for children to use to get to school.

It is not economically viable to provide bus services to most rural villages. More imagination is needed and is not reflected in the options above eg encouragement for private enterprise in transport on an affordable level

None of these are important to me. I am more concerned with keeping our villages safe from increased traffic. If the number of houses proposed are not built it will not be a problem.

We need a massive reduction in car usage for the sake of climate change, pollution and congestion

The above choices reduce pressure on roads, reduce climate impact, make spaces more pleasant for population.

Cycle routes **must** be independent of roads and pedestrians - it is not acceptable to develop cycling to the detriment and safety compromises of others

Encourage use of public transport to reduce road congestion.

In a rural area buses provide a vital link for people, both young and old, that cannot drive. In addition, they are a more carbon-efficient alternative to private cars. However, to be viable they must have an extensive network.

There are many routes throughout the borough which can be utilised for local transport by bike. Additional consideration and development of cycle routes, both on and off road, and changing current pedestrian routes to multi-use should be pursued.

Road improvements and measures to reduce road traffic, including the two above, are important to reduce

---

**User Response: Text**

congestion, air pollution and associated health impacts.

Roads are already strained, in many cases without the ability to widen at pinch points, such as parts of the A228, (nor would unsightly dual carriageways through the countryside be an improvement) due to putting all development in large pocketed areas rather than spread out. Driving into London and parking is now cheaper than rail, placing more strain on the network, yet little is being done with it.

Rail, Kent has a large commuter community but infrastructure is creaking, insufficient, and pricier than competitor counties. Much of this is, again, largely due to concentrating development in pockets which this plan looks to be continuing.

Pedestrian infrastructure, many of the sites in Kings Hill look to be removing the green space and character of the area that makes being a pedestrian a pleasant option, removal of this will increase car use. Open and green spaces need to be preserved or planned in to developments

more cycling and walking lanes

The existing bus service from Hildenborough into Tonbridge does not adequately cater for the residents of the Village needs. This results in private cars being used to make short journeys into Tonbridge. Improved public transport would overcome this and also have a benefit with regards to environmental pollution.

We need to get away from private cars which would require realistic alternatives to road transport.

Residents in Tonbridge and Malling who chose not to, or cannot, drive, are frequently treated as second class citizens. A lot of retailers and jobs are virtually inaccessible by public transport. This is socially indefensible. Unfortunately there has been significant funding for highway improvements while pavements are under-maintained, cycle paths are often worse than useless and bus services get cut. Tonbridge, Snodland, Aylesford and the Mallings are all urban centres close to much larger urban centres and should enjoy Continental quality public transport.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Sorry, I thought the answers to the question were obvious

Ironic that KCC is cutting bus funding right now which will lead to axing of services!



---

**User Response: Text**

The present bus service is inadequate. If the borough intends to build as many homes as proposed, this has to be greatly improved. This many new homes will bring so much more traffic to our roads that will have a very detrimental effect.

Rail services will be put under even more strain than at present with the proposed developments and will need to be improved.

No Response

Buses - improves use of public transport

Walking - good for health, wellbeing

Roads - for those who need to use a car

All these are important although improving roads can in some instances lead to induced demand making traffic worse.

These are the most obvious areas of weakness in this area which would be further impacted by the significant increase in population resulting from the increased housing proposed.

No response

Local transportation is pretty abismal. An innovative new strategy is required - eg driverless cars/taxis. Find ways to reduce personal vehicle ownership.

Bus services have been slashed. This leads to more private vehicles on the road which require road improvements to support and improve traffic flow. Rail access includes providing cheap and sufficient parking.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show

---

**User Response: Text**

demonstrable climate change benefits.

There is a huge opportunity to increase the number of cycle journeys locally if proper infrastructure is provided and existing cycle lanes are connected to enable journeys.

Roads are hitting diminishing returns. Other methods need to be improved

Concerns about the increase of traffic due to the proposed developments at Capel and the effect it will have on the surrounding villages such as East Peckham as people already use the back lanes to cut through from Tonbridge to Paddock Wood.

East Peckham needs better bus services.

Improving safety of local way of life.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population.

We need to get cars off of the road. As such investment in these areas is key for quality of life and health, congestion and environment. All developments should have these elements as priorities and be built into the plans.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Tonbridge traffic congestion is already appalling in rush hour most notably at junction of B245 & A227 and the general vicinity of Tonbridge Rail station

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the Borough Green and Ightham area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed. I have on many occasions been almost run over with my baby and dog walking around Ightham due to the lack of pavements and

---

**User Response: Text**

drivers not respecting the speed limit. It is very dangerous even now.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

I would have put (bus services - ie I mean public transport - not necessarily buses as we know them.) before roads but reality is that if the roads don't work then nothing does

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

Currently bus services are very limited especially during peak hours for workers and school aged children. Trains are reaching full capacity and so are the car parks. In addition many of the places to park near to stations are also being developed impeding the tax payers for getting to work.

Ditton is on the main Maidstone bus routes but have seen the local area facing bus cuts so does not encourage people not to use cars. In fact it has become the opposite.

We have seen new developments built without considering pedestrian access and have seen housing cut off from facilities due to no clear walking paths for schools etc.

All roads in the area have been hit with poor planning and the failure for KCC to consider all requirements. The pollution in the area is the highest in Kent but this is ignored in the development of further housing.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

TMBC is an area which relies heavily on the private car. Therefore improving the existing road network where necessary to support the additional development through the plan is supported. In addition, improvements to bus services and cycle routes are important, to provide real choice to future residents.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in

---

**User Response: Text**

cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

We need places to walk our dogs. And exercise.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

no comment

Trying to get to borough green from Stansted in rush hour sometimes takes an hour!

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population.

Council should work proactively with landowners to attempt to open new bridleways for cyclists

These are the most critical to get right, and I know from experience that if you get the roads & pedestrian infrastructure right that bus services & cycle routes usually come good too.

Too many developments provide insufficient main road improvements

I do not Cycle or Walk to shops etc. at present as I live in Shipbourne and would be worried about my safety.

I do however think I would use buses if they were more regular plus I am a rail commuter and a driver.

There is already way too many cars on these small rural roads. Anything to discourage car use is good.

Whilst I think that they are all important, these three probably need the most focus.

For any development to meet its sustainability objectives it needs to recognise the environment in which it is being proposed: to achieve SA 2. it needs to be recognised that any development between East Malling into

---

**User Response: Text**

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 (SA10); additional pavements and lighting along Claire Lane would cause damage to a distinct countryside environment impacting wildlife habitat (SA 5 and SA 6) through disruption of wildlife habitats and interruption of "darksies" environments; the scale of the developments will materially impact what has been described in the "East Malling Conservation Study" as an areas of "Unspoilt beauty" and would disturb the distinct, historic characters of East Malling and West Malling villages

Road capacity, particularly in and around historic towns such as West Malling is limited. It is unable to cope with extensive development.

Improve road travel and safety for both pedestrians and vehicles. Improve rail links for commuters.

Road safety, health issues

Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits

Road safety, health issues.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

We need to set challenging walking and cycling targets. Car dependency will not reduce without introducing suitable segregated infrastructure. Improved and new routes to LTN1/20 standard will deliver the modal shift we need to see to reduce the numbers of cars on arterial roads which are likely to be further congested by the Capel development in the Tunbridge Wells Local Plan.

---

**User Response: Text**

We need to improve the extent of bus services so that they meet demand by beginning early enough to take people to work and also running into the evening to encourage people to leave their cars at home and catch a bus in the knowledge that a later bus will be there to facilitate a return journey and to assist the night-time economy. We need to encourage cheap and reliable public transport so it makes economic sense to use a bus, and the roads are used by people, and small businesses, who make deliveries or need to carry equipment for work and need a vehicle.

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low Co2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits. The Borough is severely lagging behind others when it comes to safe cycle lanes. Alongside providing significant health benefits, the creation of SAFE cycle lanes on prominent routes (Hadlow Road and Shipbourne Road) would also help to reduce emissions. Our school children are currently unable to cycle from north Tonbridge to school in south Tonbridge due to the busy roads and lack of safe cycling infrastructure.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Not enough parking in the village as it is, when you want to walk anywhere you have to dodge the parked car

No comment

---

**User Response: Text**

Rydon does not have a view at this time.

- Bus services – linking developments to services and places
- Cycle routes – safe links between homes and schools, other service, places and public transport
- Pedestrian infrastructure – safe links between homes and schools, other services, places and public transport
- Rail – improving station access and links with cycling and walking routes

Roads including junction improvements

Bus services

Roads including junction improvements where needed.

Rail -improve links to the station.

Develop cycling and walking routes.

The potential development at Capel could have a devastating impact on East Peckham and surrounding roads.

**East Peckham needs a better Bus service.**

**Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.**

Bus routes supported by a good service, safe and well-designed cycle and pedestrian routes with good air quality are crucial for reducing carbon emissions, congestion and for health and safety. The most important element of use of rail services is the service itself, which is beyond the scope of the Local Plan.

- Bus services.
- Roads including junction improvements and state of repair
- Rail – improving station access and links with cycling and walking routes.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

- East Peckham needs better bus services.
- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.

Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is

---

**User Response: Text**

walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

East Peckham needs better bus services.

- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic .
- Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

Bus routes supported by a good service, safe and well-designed cycle and pedestrian routes with good air quality are crucial for reducing carbon emissions, congestion and for health and safety. The most important element of use of rail services is the service itself, which is beyond the scope of the Local Plan.

The parish council is concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells borough in particular the proposed relevant cable on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including E Peckham.

- roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic
- East Peckham these better services
- better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on roads although no stations will perform S presence in east Peckham

To meet climate crisis there is a strong need to get people out of their cars and to use public transport and green alternatives such as cycling and pedestrian travel. The Local Plan should therefore seek to promote such means of transport above private car usage, both within new developments and within the existing communities. WMPC notes with alarm the reduction in local bus services due to KCC cutting subsidies to local services and also notes substantial government funding to KCC to provide new and innovative public transport services. Schemes such as car sharing, renting cars as and when have proved popular in cities and could be rolled out, perhaps with subsidy from 106 Agreements in TMBC. Most private cars spend most of their time parked, taking up road space, involving huge personal cost to achieve very little. This is outdated thinking and the Local Plan could seek to address this.

Safety is a major impediment to both cycle use and to pedestrian travel. So better segregation between such travel and motorised transport is key to increasing the use of noncarbon-based transport. New developments must prioritise the encouragement of cycle and pedestrian travel by providing safe dedicated cycle and pedestrian avenues to places people will wish to visit. This is difficult on rural roads where speed reduction may increase a sense of safety.



---

**User Response: Text**

All of the issues identified in Question 22 are relevant. Site refs. 59764 & 59765 are in an accessible location – with good access to rail, pedestrian, cycle and bus service facilities. Users and occupiers of the site will therefore have excellent access to these facilities without the need for private car use for everyday needs and travel. However only 3 can be selected above.

With regards to road improvements, these are important when providing new development to ensure that existing infrastructure can accommodate or be changed to accommodate growth. However, with the focus on creating sustainable development and communities, and reducing the reliance on private cars for travel, it is essential that footpath and cycle routes are provided, enhanced and maintained to encourage these alternative transport options. The position of the site near to the town centre and railway station also means that future occupiers can walk or cycle to the station. This can be encouraged through signage within the developed and as part of a green travel plan.

Quality of life for residents.

There has been inadequate investment in the Kings Hill area for all of these, and all should be considered as priorities.

Quality of life for residents.

There has been inadequate investment in the Kings Hill area for all of these, and all should be considered as priorities.

43. Bus services : Trenport considers more needs to be done in the Borough with KCC and bus operators to ensure long term provision of bus services, particularly where these link emerging or proposed developments. Trenport have proposed significant contributions to bus services relating to Peters Village, only to find that services have been unilaterally withdrawn. Trenport is working with KCC and the bus operator to reverse this decision. However it is highly relevant that a large proportion of bus services in the Borough are subsidised and therefore subject to future uncertainty. Decisions on the location of new development need to be made with an understanding of the long term viability of services.

The roads in West Malling and generally narrow and already many are clogged with parked cars making them difficult to navigate. West Street, through with all traffic from Offham Road, Normal Road and the estate area accessed via Fatherwell Avenue passes in single lane at the junction with High Street and is already problematic to navigate. More housing will significantly increase traffic having to use the roads and increase the problems at the West Street high Street junction, which is already very dangerous and congested.

This question requests that 3no. transport issues are selected as priorities for investment from the above list. We consider that in order to deliver strategic growth across the Borough, improvement of the road infrastructure is key to ensuring sustainable development and growth within the Borough. Furthermore, investment into bus services is key to ensure that services are viable, particularly in more rural areas. Providing a network of cycle routes will also improve accessibility and promote more sustainable forms of transport.

---

### User Response: Text

Question 22 sets out a number of transport matters and asks ‘which matter most of you?’, whilst Question 23 asks for an explanation of the respondent’s reasoning.

Vistry consider that improving access to railway stations will promote sustainable patterns of development. Key to this will be identifying and securing opportunities to promote new pedestrian and cycle linkages.

In the case of Hildenborough Railway Station, the proposed development of Land South of Noble Tree Road could facilitate such investment, as part of a package of Section 106 / Section 278 enhancements. These would be in addition to connectivity achieved through the site, within a permeable site layout. The provision of new homes at the site would also promote patronage of the rail services available from the station and facilitate sustainable travel.

Linked to the above, the provision of enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes generally is a clear priority for achieving sustainable development. Upgrades and enhancements to existing routes and the provision of new connections will provide new opportunities for active travel. Such upgrades should aim to facilitate safe routes to key destinations, like local shops or transport nodes.

Improving bus services is a further priority, with frequent services being demonstrated to promote sustainable travel behaviours. A future development to the South of Noble Tree Road would facilitate investment in local routes, potentially allowing for (already good) service frequencies to be further improved. This is in addition to the additional patronage which will be generated from future residents living at the site.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Road safety, health issues. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits.

Walking and Parking are the most important issues.

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the

---

**User Response: Text**

result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

Because I walk, and cars park on the pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments

There are limitations in certain areas such as West Malling - where West Street and the protected nature of this street would prevent suitable road links being developed, as this street could not be widened. Development in West Malling could potentially cause grid lock in the town due to West Street seeing an increase in traffic

Dangerous walking

Rail encourages outside commuting.

Cyclists should be banned, not encouraged.

- **Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.**
- **Any development would lead to increased traffic on small country lanes**

Arriva buses are unreliable and badly run (drivers discourteous and rude) railways are disruptive and erratic & both need to be vastly improved. Roads are in a terrible condition (potholes, subsidence & breaking tar mac surfaces) all due to extreme traffic which the village cannot sustain.

Because I walk, and cars park on the b\*\*\*y pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments

Bus walking parking.

**Local government have slashed bus services and so if you haven't a car you need to rely on other forms of transport.**

**Walking to take in the AONB we live in**

**Parking the IGN3 do not provide sufficient parking for new developments**

---

### User Response: Text

1. Bus services.

2. Junction improvements on the Whitehill, Nepicar and Gravesend Road Roundabouts plus the limited slip roads at M25 junction 5

1. Bus services are essential for children to get to school and for reducing car dependence. It can improve air quality and reduce CO2 emissions by reducing individual car use.

2. At present we do not have good public transport but we do have massive queuing at road junctions around Wrotham. Idling vehicles causes pollution and poor air quality.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells borough council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for the neighboring areas including East Peckham.

- **East Peckham needs better bus services.**
- **The roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.**
- **Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimize traffic on the roads, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.**

Roads in and around West Malling have limitations bad bends and junctions particularly the pinch point at the junction of West St + High St.

Bus Services are also very limited.

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the Borough Green and Ightham area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

This question requests that 3no. transport issues are selected as priorities for investment from the above list. We consider that improvement of the road infrastructure is key to the delivery of strategic growth across the Borough. Furthermore, to ensure that services are viable, particularly in more rural areas, investment into bus services is key. New developments also have the potential to fund the upgrading/provision of new cycle networks/ routes, which will improve accessibility and promote more sustainable forms of transport.

Roads as infrastructure requires improvement, transport requirements are in a state of change.

---

**User Response: Text**

All are important to support the existing community never mind an expanding one.

Bus services need to be comprehensive - they are often not at present. For most people, certainly outside the major centres, cars are essential. Building more houses will of course make everything worse.

Public transport needs to be improved together with access on foot.

Work is interlinked with transport. In a rural environment you cannot hope to achieve coverage with bus services and distances are significant so that cycling is not a practical option.

- **Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.**
- **East Peckham needs better bus services.**
- **Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.**

Walking and parking.

Because I walk, and cars park on the b\*\*\*y pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments.

The roads in West Malling are already at capacity. West Street which is the main way through to the village is single lane with no opportunity to widen it due to the layout. Offham Road is also terrible, with cars park on both sides of the road which at times creates gridlock and is no way fit to carry more traffic.

Both of these routes are also next to the only school that we have.

Pavements often inaccessible to pedestrians/disabled/people with buggies because cars park on them as there are insufficient parking spaces;

Public transport needs to be a viable option.

West Malling cannot cope with more housing or development as the roads are not wide enough. There are already problem areas.

Road congestion and pollution already exists in the area, adding large developments will just add to an

---

**User Response: Text**

unacceptable position. Also not enough parking space is allowed on new developments

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially the disabled, young mothers with prams, and families with children, who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed, putting lives at risk. An increase in the number of cars, commensurate with an increase in the number of residents in the area would exacerbate this yet further. This is unacceptable for the safety of people.

Road safety issues

Roads which are part of the essential character of the village limit development e.g. beyond the pinch point of West Street.

Walking and Parking are the most important issues.

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially the disabled, young mothers with prams, and families with children, who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed, putting lives at risk. An increase in the number of cars, commensurate with an increase in the number of residents in the area would exacerbate this yet further. This is unacceptable for the safety of people.

- **Bus services.**
- **Roads including junction improvements.**
- **Rail – improving station access and links with cycling and walking routes.**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

- **East Peckham needs better bus services.**
- **Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.**

**Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.**

Bus, walking, parking.

Rail connections are good but do not take me everywhere that I need to go. Pavements are too narrow in many places and used as parking spots. Provision of adequate parking would prevent parking on the pavement.

---

**User Response: Text**

The limitations of roads in West Malling to cope with more development, especially West Street which cannot be widened to accommodate new infrastructure to support housing.

Congestion on roads leading down to Mereworth from West Malling.

Narrow and limited footpath along the bottom of Offham Road and Swan Street.

We have briefly outlined some of our main reasons, as follows:

? Bus services – to provide people with more sustainable transport options, plus cater for those who do not have access or private car and where walking/cycling is not practical.

? Pedestrian infrastructure – new developments in the Green Belt should have link paths to existing Public Rights of Ways, to provide better access and benefit from the Green Belt.

? Roads including junction improvements – any development policies for our town must take account of existing infrastructure constraints (inc. highways capacity), in order to achieve sustainable development. We have further discussed this above (incl. Q.11 & 21).

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

- **East Peckham needs better bus services.**
- **Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.**

**Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.**

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

**Local government have slashed bus services and so if you haven't a car you need to rely on other forms of transport.**

**Walking to take in the AONB we live in**

**Parking the IGN3 do not provide sufficient parking for new developments**

All the above are necessary for a modern integrated transport strategy that addresses the need for low CO2 emissions to reverse climate change, road safety and creating a healthier population. Only a very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrable climate change benefits, and behaviour change in the local population.

---

**User Response: Text**

A228 often becomes a bottleneck when it goes down to one lane. Improve frequency of trains to London. Safe cycle routes to encourage people to leave cars at home.

Bus, walking, parking

Rail connections are good but do not take me everywhere that I need to go. Pavements are too narrow in many places and used as parking spots. Provision of adequate parking would prevent parking on the pavement.

Only a small proportion of people cycle and rail services serve limited parts of the borough.

Train – A link to Sevenoaks

A rail link to Sevenoaks would hugely reduce traffic on the roads. Businesses in the area would see an increase in footfall.

Pavements in the area are shockingly small and with the amount of lorries coming through it won't be long until somebody dies. This warning seems to fall on deaf ears.

- East Peckham needs better bus services.
- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.
- Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

- East Peckham needs better bus services.
- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.
- Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

Common sense

Not enough parking in the village as it is, when you want to walk anywhere you have to dodge the parked car

Walking and Parking

Because I walk, and cars park on the b\*\*\*y pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments



---

### User Response: Text

Road Safety! Health issues - as already mentioned. Only very large increase in cover and frequency of bus services will show demonstrative climate change benefits.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

- East Peckham needs better bus services.
- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.
- Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

- East Peckham needs better bus services.
- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.
- Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

Pavements often inaccessible to pedestrians/disabled/people with buggies because cars park on them as there are insufficient parking spaces;

Public transport needs to be a viable option

Most people walk to some extent, have never been able to balance on a bike, quite aside from the distances involved to reach Maidstone, London, etc. I try to use rail where feasible (though public transport options being as they are, the necessity of parking is used to supplement impractical routes via other means)

Roads and walking are the most important issues.

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the Borough Green and Ightham area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

---

**User Response: Text**

Roads and walking are the most important issues.

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the Borough Green and Ightham area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

West Malling cannot cope with more housing or development as the roads are not wide enough. There are already problem areas.

The limitations of roads in West Malling to cope with more development, especially West Street which cannot be widened to accommodate new infrastructure to support housing.

Congestion on roads leading down to Mereworth from West Malling.

Narrow and limited footpath along the bottom of Offham Road and Swan Street.

Walking and parking. Because I walk and am sick of cars parking on pavements as developers do not provide adequate parking on new developments. Expecting people to use non-existent public transport is laughable.

not enough parking in the village as it is, when you want to walk anywhere you have to dodge the parked car

I have 3 teenagers who need buses /trains to get to school college etc. I drive so need roads and parking. We also like to walk in our beautiful surrounding countryside without having to drive first. It was the one thing that kept us all mentally sane during lockdown. The thought of losing our green space makes me sick to my stomach

We need to have a lot better public transport to reduce the need for car journeys

Because I walk, and cars park on the b\*\*\*y pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must

---

**User Response: Text**

therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

They are the most relevant to my family and also the most important in maintaining the character of the village and surrounds.

Bus services need to be regular and frequent. Safe cycle routes would reduce pollution and provide exercise. Pedestrian infrastructure to give safety to walkers, mums with prams and people with mobility issues.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

- East Peckham needs better bus services.
- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.
- Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.

- East Peckham needs better bus services.
- Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.
- Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.

Road improvement required prior to any new development; pavements and footpaths should be well maintained and safe to use; Bus services must be retained to rural communities; parking must be adequate for new development.

Because I walk, and cars park on the b\*\*\*y pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments

Because I walk, and cars park on the b\*\*\*y pavement, because IGN3 does not allow enough space on new developments

---

### User Response: Text

There is limited space for roads and pathways accessing in and around the area local to West Malling for new developments, especially West Street which cannot be widened to accommodate new infrastructure to support housing.

I live in a part of Ightham with no roadside footpaths. It's very dangerous competing with cars.

All. I like to cycle and walk.

Bus, Walking, Parking.

Rail connections are good but do not take me everywhere that I need to go. Pavements are too narrow in many places and used as parking spots. Provision of adequate parking would prevent parking on the pavement.

**I am already concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham. As it is today, Rush hour is extended due to the amount of traffic on the roads and further housing without adequate road improvement will further impact the issue**

- **East Peckham needs better bus services.**
- **Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.**
- **Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.**

Road safety & health issues plus frequency of bus services.

As cars become more expensive to own and bus transport links are vital means of people getting about especially the elderly.

1. Bus services.
2. Junction improvements on the Whitehill, Nepicar and Gravesend Road Roundabouts

Answer

1. Bus services are essential for children to get to school and for reducing car dependence. It can improve air quality and reduce CO2 emissions by reducing individual car use.
2. At present we do not have good public transport but we do have massive queuing at road junctions around Wrotham. Idling vehicles causes pollution and poor air quality.

---

**User Response: Text**

- **Bus services.**
- **Roads including junction improvements.**
- **Rail – improving station access and links with cycling and walking routes.**

**I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at Capel, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas including East Peckham.**

- **East Peckham needs better bus services.**
- **Roads locally cannot cope with increased traffic.**

**Better pedestrian access to railways would hopefully help minimise traffic on road, although no station is walkable for most residents in East Peckham.**

Parking is already an issue for the residents in the Borough Green and Ightham area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:12:59. Total records: 590

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 26] What are your reasons for selecting this partic...

### User Response: Text

Preservation of greenbelt

Tonbridge has the potential to become a much bigger and better town.

Because you didn't provide an option to not develop I have had to select this one.

Tonbridge has all the infrastrucure already in place and there are business and job opportunities in the town.

This is exactly what is needed.

Minimises the use of green field sites. However, this will need careful planning of infrastructure such as GP surgeries and school places.

Current infrastructure is unable to support current traffic in the Tonbridge area. Multi-site complexes have already been built within the town centre where residents have to travel out of Tonbridge for retail and social needs. Opportunities to develop town centre to be more social, economically friendly to small independent retailers and make more use of already pedestrianised areas.

Tonbridge has significant potential for a new master planned community using council owned land: new public spaces, shops and services delivered alongside new homes. The historic character of the town must be preserved but at present there are way too many car parks which is a poor use of land which is otherwise highly sustainable.

Much of the countryside around Tonbridge has a high landscape value and should be safeguarded when there are so many brownfield sites in the town.

We shouldn't build on Green Belt. Having said that, I don't believe that Tonbridge's infrastructure (roads, water, drains, schools, medical facilities) has the capacity for the level of development envisaged in all of the options.

If you are going to build new houses at any cost (seems to the plan) then you should make them places people are actually going to enjoy living in. And that means reducing densities. We saw the impact of this on people during the pandemic.

Better to lose some of the green belt in this area than make people ill.

Because infrastructure and services are already in place

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roof for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

---

**User Response: Text**

Sick to death of urban sprawl and destruction of green belt

I do not want to see a reduction in the green belt especially around Tonbridge.

We need density

good transport links and access to services. Greater the density the more high street and public transport is supported,

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

ReTaining green space but repurposing of empty units should come first.

However the town is already over full with cars and roads clogged.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and use a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in existing areas of high density.

We must prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages, whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

I am not a frequent visitor to Tonbridge as there is currently little of attraction for me or my family there. The fact that it is also poorly connected in terms of public transport and the roads are over congested at peak times makes the journey even less worthwhile. I think that in terms of The Local Plan, the fact that it is the principal town in the TMBC area every opportunity should be taken to make it a destination location. This will need a considerable investment in sustainable transport links and a more attractive environment for any visitor.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.



---

**User Response: Text**

We are destroying the natural environment there is too much traffic and over development, there is so much empty space ex office and retail space that could be used, be creative for Goodness sake!

To protect the Green Belt. Town centres have already been sacrificed.

This will make use of sites suitable for development in an already urban area where good transport links are available.

There isn't a need for urban sprawl. But there is most definitely not a need to carve up the Kent Countryside reducing arable and livestock provision and increasing carbon production

If areas can be sensibly repurposed and appropriate services provided, then it makes more sense to use those than to build on green areas which could be improved to help combat climate change and support our wildlife instead.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Less harm to AONB, Green Belt and protection of heritage assets.

The Green Belt was designated for a reason. If we allow urban sprawl on our watch where will it ever end? The answer is it won't, and we will build on more and more of the countryside and end up (to quote Joni Mitchell), viewing trees in museums. Maximising development sites within Tonbridge will invigorate the town, as long as facilities and services match housing so that the town doesn't turn into one huge housing estate, like poor Edenbridge where I grew which has lost its whole identity and sense of community from over development without .

Tonbridge is a large town with all the infrastructure and shops for a large population.

Keep development in the built-up areas, not the countryside...

Key is to maintain the character of an area rather than cramming too much in. Moreover, there is not the parking for intensification in Tonbridge

This is a fine balance and must be made on making Tonbridge an attractive place to live work and relax in.

Tonbridge needs more affordable social housing, not 'executive developments' eating into the green belt. It needs residents who will shop locally and use the town centre not drive out to Tunbridge Wells and Sevenoaks.

Because once greenbelt land is gone there is no going back, Kent is the garden of England and building on it will

---

**User Response: Text**

make it a patio rather than a garden

If you are going to build new houses, then at least make them places people will enjoy living in

Tonbridge would be nicer if you took the two way traffic out of the town

To reduce the impact on the Green Belt and natural environment, and to improve sustainability. Plus, Tonbridge has good provision of open space for leisure.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.  
(= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

I think this will have most value to all residents

Green belt should be protected at all costs.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low-density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

IT should make best use of existings transport/health/retail infrastructure. The caveat however is of course that it

---

**User Response: Text**

is possible. If it cannot support the c 800 pa target then I would have no problem at all with moving to option 2 with its associated need for investment and the likely objections that would be rased by more rural communities

This is the best option for transforming Tonbridge into an attractive, functioning town where people will be pleased to live and work.

In addition to skillful town planners, the involvement of representatives from banks, finance institutions, and white collar industrialists plus a talented marketing and sales team would secure the success of this option.

Re-using existing land (caveat being excluding the areas prone to flooding), makes the best sense.

Flooding will be a recurring issue in Tonbridge as our weather changes to be more extreme. Building where this isn't an issue would make the most sense. Releasing some disused land back to nature to give capacity to the river would also make sense

We must preserve Green Belt and Best Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (=Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

preserving the Green Belt

Preservation of Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) is vital also to prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Notable to comment.

The centre of Tonbridge is already highly developed with constant pressure of traffic; if further housing development in this area is needed I feel that, although green belt should be protected, this option is probably the better one.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge feels vibrant compared to other equivalent towns. There is a mix of people, shops, restaurants, activities and so on. This is a real positive. Keeping this vibrant involves keeping up footfall and increasing links into town - concentrating "town" activities to towns.

Protecting the green belt is a priority for the majority of residents (e.g. Ipsos MORI polling, 2015).

Maintaining biodiversity, local wildlife populations, and irreplaceable areas of natural beauty.

It preserves Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable agricultural land. (Grades 1, 2, 3A), prevents sprawl towards surrounding villages and preserves the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

TM Borough housing affordability average ratio of 13.4 % is higher than both Kent and Southeast England which TMBC use as the reason for future development. Broadly speaking the distribution of wealth is greater towards the west of the Borough, Tonbridge's affordability ratio being to the order of 19 %.

Using similar logic to TMBC, additional development is required towards the West e.g. Tonbridge (rather than the Northeast of the Borough where it's more likely to be developed).

Predominantly to preserve green spaces and rural areas. People expect town centres to be densely populated. We need to stop cutting down woodland and destroying wildlife habitat to build houses.

We should build homes in vacant offices, retail spaces and derelict buildings rather than on green spaces

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural lands.

To prevent the srwal towards surrounding Villages.

---

**User Response: Text**

To preserve the semi-rural and low-density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Preserving green belt and agricultural land, and preserving the semi rural nature of the surrounding villages.

Utilising town centre and brownfield sites first to preserve green belt land

A more distributed approach will avoid creating more hotspots, and placing pressure on local services. Tonbridge is already highly congested and focussing development there will simply make the situation worse.

Maximising densities within the urban area of Tonbridge will deliver limited types of dwellings, such as high rise flats and high density terraced housing. Such maximum densities are not going to deliver the breadth of house types needed to support a growing, thriving and balanced community.

Option 2 should deliver carefully designed development within the urban area, which can maximise density where possible, but at the same time deliver quality development on the outer edge of Tonbridge meeting the need of growing families to ensure that all residents have a choice of where to live and are not forced to leave the town due to lack of choice or options for new homes.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low-density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

With such a small percentage (28%) of TMBC area being outside the Green Belt, no further building should be done to diminish this. All building should be on existing brownfield sites or not at all.

Protection of green open spaces

Must preserve green belt and best most valuable (BMV) agricultural land (equals grades ,l 2, 3a)

To prevent sprawl to surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

Protect the Greenbelt.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and BMV agricultural land. ( Grades 1,2,3A )

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Must preserve green belt and best most valuable (BMV) agricultural land (equals Grades 1, 2 and 3a)

To prevent sprawl to surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

The average new build house will have at least one car and probably two or three and this means that , taking the plans of our council and that of Tunbridge Wells into account , an additional 20.000 cars on the local roads plus service vehicles, contractors and delivery vans.

We **must** preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

There are many sites in Tonbridge that are not being used effectively and lay empty (for example the building which once housed Beales). It is better that we change the use of these sites rather than leaving them to waste. These sites are attractive to potential residents, including younger buyers, as they are close to the town's amenities.

This would help protect the green belt for future generations and be more eco friendly in light of climate change.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge has the infrastructure for a large population

---

**User Response: Text**

Noting the existing infrastructure is largely in place, and any new development must be 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.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To Option 1 - Optimise densities on development sites within Tonbridge, particularly on those sites within the town centre, maximising their potential for residential and mixed-use development. Option 2 - Conservative densities on development sites within Tonbridge, minimising the intensification of existing built-up areas for residential and mixed-use development. preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge has by far the best facilities and communications.

Existing infrastructure and preserving greenbelt

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Encroachment on Green Belt of option 2 not desirable.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent

---

**User Response: Text**

sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Maximise use of urban areas to preserve the green belt

The Urban areas have most infrastructure services and can be more easily adapted to house more people

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.  
To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Maximising developed areas with infrastructure is better than removing farm land from neighbouring villages.

Once the Green Belt has been developed, it cannot be recovered. Tonbridge has the full range of infrastructure (albeit not in the necessary quantities) to support new housing.

Preservation of Green Belt and Most valuable agricultural land

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages

to make the most of the opportunities present by the changing dynamics on the high street

to preserve the semi rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town



---

**User Response: Text**

Protection of Green belt and keeping integrity of villages

Green belt and AONB need to be protected

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Maintain integrity of green belt whilst making better use of existing land opportunities in Tonbridge town centre. Perhaps creating a new light industrial area and use existing space for residential??

We must preserve Green belt and best,most valuable (BMW) agricultural land. (Grades 1,2,3a)

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages

To preserve the semi rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

I think it is important to protect the rural boundaries of existing settlements / villages. Thus for example Hildenborough should not be essentially "merged" with Tonbridge as could well happen if Site 59804 were to be approved for inclusion in the local plan

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

But my choice is not for everyone, because not everyone wish to live in a town - hence there are a large number of people leaving London and the suburbs.

To keep Greenbelt and stop the spread of housing across quality farmland.

We need to preserve Green Belt and stop areas being joined together.

---

**User Response: Text**

In theory option 1 makes sense. However unless proper outer ring roads beyond cannon lane and a21 ( which also hasn't got access from north Tonbridge, why is there no connection via hildenborough at least) are provided, Tonbridge just cannot take the traffic that comes with it. Maybe south Tonbridge (judd) does, but high street and cannon lane can't. Hence the thought that smaller stations ought to be utilised MUCH better. Borough green, but also the area around hildenborough station or east mailing. Both seem to have fields in walking distance. Odd.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.  
(= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Development will rely upon existing infrastructure which in turn can be updated rather than encroaching on the Green Belt.

A reduction in road space to provide cycle lanes will be very dangerous in many places - e.g. junctions with the A26 leading into Tonbridge centre. It is completely unrealistic to think that on-street parking can be eliminated, as there is often nowhere else to park.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.

(=Grades 1,2,3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low- density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the Town.

I would prefer to see the Tonbridge town centre pedestrianised, with more green spaces and making better use of the river embankments and adjoining areas in a coherent (not piecemeal) layout.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low-density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (=Grade 1,2,3A).

---

### User Response: Text

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge, like many other towns is losing its retail heart. Big retailers are abandoning town centres in favour of "out of town" retail sites where car parking is not an issue. Local bus services do not however seem to react to this trend thereby further discouraging shopping in local towns or retail parks. More and more shopping is made "on line" with the associated home delivery services which only increases local traffic flow. With more and more vacant retail units appearing in town centres the redevelopment to residential units is sensible. There are only so many vacant shops that can be converted to cafes/ eateries - the capacity to support more is not limitless. Covid has discouraged social meeting to a degree. Inflationary trends will also restrict individuals' spending powers thereby increasing pressure on the leisure and catering industry. It all seems to be one big self-fulfilling prophecy.

Existing infrastructure and protecting greenbelt

Green Belt and AONB were conceived to preserve the natural environment and reduce urban sprawl. The reasons for preserving the Green Belt and AONB are just as relevant if not more relevant today than when they were introduced.

The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas. As the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl, protection of the Green Belt and AONB should remain to **check the unrestricted sprawl, prevent neighbouring towns and villages from merging** into one another, to assist in **safeguarding the countryside** from encroachment, to **preserve the setting and special character of historic towns**; to **assist in urban regeneration**, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Tonbridge is already built up and its character will not change with the addition of significantly more housing - this cannot be said for the small towns and villages in the Green Belt/AONB area. The additional population may also help Tonbridge economically which appears to be less than the sum of its parts.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi-storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofs for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

---

**User Response: Text**

Green field sites need to be protected for wild life and biodiversity

Protect the green belt, protect already overloaded infrastructure, protect existing developments from increased risk of flooding due to overdevelopment of certain areas, protect the gap between Tonbridge and Hildenborough so they remain separate entities.

To avoid having large areas of big shops left unused

Preserve greenbelt and best agricultural land

Prevent urban sprawl

Preserve low density, semi rural housing on town fringes

All mention before

Protect the green belt, protect already overloaded infrastructure, protect existing developments from increased risk of flooding due to overdevelopment of certain areas, protect the gap between Tonbridge and Hildenborough so they remain separate entities.

Option 1 is in line with government guidelines, associated with the uplift due to the high house price / earnings ratio in the borough.

Option 1 is in line with Government Guidelines, associated with the uplift due to the high house price/ earnings ratio in the borough

Covered elsewhere.

Not everyone wishes to live in a town.

Preserve green belt and agricultural land; minimise the need to create increased traffic volumes and climate impact from that due to the out of town location of such developments.

Focus on exploiting PDL, brown field and already invested non-green belt development areas (e.g. Medway gap) and the major transport infrastructure that these benefit from; and therefore avoiding unnecessary 'urban sprawl'

---

**User Response: Text**

that might otherwise result.

Tonbridge has the infrastructure for high population.

We should maximise use of existing town sites and brownfield first, ensuring increased densities where appropriate.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.  
(= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

avoid green field sites

This is a green solution to meeting housing need and sustaining economic development in the urban centres

Build the houses where people can easily walk and cycle to the shops.

As I said in an earlier comment, until it's easier to travel from the outreaches of tonbridge without a car, option 1 is better. Option 2 would just make the traffic problem even worse.

Tonbridge is already a town and has the infrastructure for a higher population. Use of Green belt should be avoided at all costs. This might also help to revive the high street.

Green field sites are too important to lose.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

---

**User Response: Text**

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

I don't agree with either option as both have the green belt included and this should be protected.

As mentioned above, would prefer existing green field not released for development.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

Must preserve Green Belt to avoid development sprawl and retain the rural fringes to the town, and never destroy high value, high grade agricultural land in favour of development in these pressing times which are predicted to be with us into the foreseeable, if not forever.

Agricultural land must be preserved as must the Green Belt.

To avoid sprawl into our local villages.

As you have explained this will minimise the use of green field sites.

To minimise the need for the release of green field sites beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, in the Green Belt, primarily for residential development.

Preservation of Green Belt is my priority – once it's gone it can never be replaced, and I believe it should be protected above and beyond anything else.

Consolidating the town centre instead of its current sprawl might make it a more attractive centre and heart of the borough.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Good transport and other infrastructure already in place.

We must preserve green belt and best/most valuable (BMV) agricultural land.

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding village boundaries.

To preserve the semi-rural and low-density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of town.

Tonbridge already has facilities and infrastructure

We must preserve the Green Belt.

We must preserve our Best Most Valuable agricultural land.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

I think a combination of both options is the best way forward. Utilising town centre development sites where possible and controlled expansion of the town boundary to permit the development of needs which cannot be met in the town centre. The crucial issue is the provision of infrastructure and services in line with the expansion of the population.

Tonbridge is able to take more development without impacting the town and locale as it is already a dense environment.

Green Belt and AONB are crucial to fight climate change, retain farmland, preserve the natural environment and bio-diversity and reduce urban sprawl.

Green Belt and AONB should remain to stop any urban sprawl, prevent neighbouring towns and villages from merging into one another, and to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Development should be focused on big towns not small rural villages which have already seen much large development.

---

**User Response: Text**

Greenfield and aonb should be preserved at all costs

I think greenbelt should be protected at all costs.

There should be no development on Green belt land

Green Belt needs to be preserved for current and future generations.

Preserve Green Belt land

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

protect the green belt

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable agricultural land (grades 1, 2, 3A).

Also, we need to prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

Lastly, this will help to preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

high density housing works well, draws people into the centre making sure it remains a thriving place

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town



---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.

(= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

I believe in maximising the use of brown field sites, and raising the importance of Tonbridge town as a useful mix of shops, leisure and residential properties, and to raise the general standard of the town.

we must maintain our green spaces

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Existing infrastructure, protect green belt and AONB

Tonbridge has good transport connections and new mixed use development especially flats for first time buyers or those who wish to downsize should be encouraged especially on any underused brownfield sites within the town.

Much as though I would not like to see development encroach on the Green Belt, I am wary that overly dense

---

**User Response: Text**

development in Tonbridge could bring its own tensions, particularly if there is insufficient provision of space and leisure / social interaction opportunities in the immediate surroundings for new residents.

To preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable agricultural land. (Grades 1, 2, 3A)

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages

To preserve semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of town.

As Tonbridge expands the infrastructure would be inward looking as the facilities already exist

Preserve green belt and BMV agricultural land

prevent sprawl to surrounding villages

preserve semi-rural, low density character of existing housing estates of edge of town

They brownfield sites so maximise then ti minimise green belt loss. This also takes advantage of existing infrastructure. Furthermore such sites are generally more desirable for first time buyers needing access to the work place.

We may not like the fact that retail is moving on line. Not totally but fairly dramatically.

Embrace this change and build on the vacated town centre space.

Densities can be maximised as those that will like to live in these urban areas will not want gardens or car parking.

Green Belt land and Best, Most Valuable agricultural land must be protected (Grades 1,2,3a)

To prevent sprawl to surrounding villages

To preserve the semi-rural and low-density character in the existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.

(=Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

---

**User Response: Text**

To preserve the semi-rural and low-density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of town.

There are people who enjoy living in a town, and those who prefer to live in a village. In general, people who prefer to live in a village do so in the knowledge that there are travel implications regarding some facilities and services, whereas those who opt to live in a town do so in the knowledge that it will be busier with a denser population but with facilities and jobs nearby.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and use a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in existing areas of high density.

We must prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages, whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

I consider the green belt a good idea. This I have covered in earlier answers.

Tonbridge is already very densely populated and I have already had difficulties getting an ambulance, getting an appointment with my GP and getting an X-ray booked. If there are many new builds in Tonbridge itself then it would put even more stress on local services. It would not be good to tear down lovely historic old buildings in Tonbridge for new builds.

---

**User Response: Text**

Less impact on green belt and improve sustainability.

Would promote Tonbridge as a larger town which would enable shops and leisure facilities to be able to flourish. Lots of secondary schools in Tonbridge so reduce need for longer journeys by secondary school age children

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and BMV agricultural land.

To prevent urban sprawl towards villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Encourages use of 'brown field sites' rather than encroaching into Green Belt.

No Response

Preserve Green Belt

Prevent sprawl

Preserve semi-rural character of existing estates

We must preserve Green Belt and most valuable agricultural land.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the edge of town.

I think we need a middle option

Over intensification in the town of housing will lead to parking problems. Already blocks of flats are built without sufficient parking available to every household. Large blocks of flats are not conducive to a town of Tonbridge's historic character.

---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge is a major services and communications hub in the borough with the best rail links to London for commuting, as well as many of the best schools. It is the aspirational jumping off point for people moving out of London, looking for more affordable places to buy or rent, but still working in central London. As such it should provide commensurate residential opportunities and amenities but currently it does not. The centre is run down and lacks suitable housing, given over as it is to low density retail, car parks and rail track yards. Residential development is pushed to the periphery, requiring longer bus or car commutes, resulting in congestion and pollution. It now requires a comprehensive and planned redevelopment of the town centre to deliver high quality and high density urban apartments above retail, social and leisure facilities, to deliver an attractive urban living experience, appropriate to aspirations and its strategic location. This requires significant intensification of the central area, but also infill development in the surrounding residential ring of relatively low density mid century development, in order to reduce any expansion of the outer periphery.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Both options are unwelcome given the considerable development that has taken place in Tonbridge in recent years. However optimising densities in the centre is preferable to sacrificing green belt and promoting urban sprawl. That said, optimising densities should not be interpreted as ruining the town with tower blocks. Four storeys should be a maximum.

A good contribution to the situation would be to build a , or several, multi (but not too many) storey car park (s) screened by other buildings to free up the large areas of car parks in the centre for development. I like the idea of a town square on the site of the car park between the arcades and Sainsburys.

My preferred option is **OPTION 1** - to optimise existing areas of development without the need to release GREEN BELT sites.

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure. However, flooding is an issue and this must be addressed first.

To avoid development on green field sites beyond town centre but to also retain open spaces in town centre

Tonbridge is already very built up in the town centre presenting an unattractive proposition for potential residential sites.

Better infrastructure and it will preserve the green belt

---

**User Response: Text**

I do not want the increase in release of greenfield sites. The rural character of this area should be maintained.

to avoid development on the greenbelt AONB and keep to urban areas where infrastructure present

Green belt land should be protected

Existing infrastructure and protecting green belt/ AONB

No response

It would be good to see more regeneration of Tonbridge both with residential and commercial properties being used to maximum effect, and possibly thereby reducing the need for car use.

better and more economical to use what is already there. Green belt land should be preserved that is what is was designed to be

Existing infrastructure and protecting greenbelt

As per all answers above, building on greenbelt land is not the way forward, there are plenty of existing brownfield sites that can be used.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Prioritises the reduction in need for green field.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low-density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge is a town with facilities and infrastructure already in place for a high population.

Design a flood proof development.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. =Grades 1,2,3A

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Preserve Green Belt, and prevent sprawl.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

I can't really say, I don't go to Tonbridge often.

we need tonbridge but it is dying needs housing and people quality shops to attract people to live and visit

- maximising potential is my preference above spread out development. Spreading out increases distances to travel, more cars on the road and greater pollution.

Preservation of Green Belt and most valuable agricultural land

Prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages

To make the most of opportunities presented by the changing dynamics of the high street

to preserve the semi rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Rural areas need to remain rural

Prevent urban sprawl outwards & preserve greenbelt & agricultural land.

Must stop building on green fields when there are brown field sites to use first.

no comment

To minimise the impact on the green belt and natural environment, and improve sustainability. Tonbridge also has good provision of open space for leisure.

The green belt needs to be preserved throughout the county

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. We must preserve Green belt and agricultural land and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where there is already the case is sensible

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

If we are going to use current car parking space to build on then we absolutely must replicate this parking elsewhere as it is still very much used so an easily accessible replacement needs to be made.

I do not believe there are any reasonable grounds to ignore the importance of the greenbelt, especially given that there are options to build elsewhere.

We must preserve Green Belt, Best Most Versatile Land (=Grades 1,2,3A) and other productive agricultural land.

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.



---

**User Response: Text**

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Hildenborough is already facing issues with overdevelopment and should not be included in the area for further development. With large developments currently in progress, the B245 road is already busy and further development would create traffic issues and delays into Tonbridge. The plans to include Hildenborough would make local services such as Doctors or schools impossible to get into (with potential for hundreds more houses) which are already full (i had to join a Doctor miles away.... and not in my village). I have two young children and the prospects are already challenging to get into the local schools due to capacity issues. Part of the reason to move here was the schools and green space to walk and enjoy. The village of hildenborough will likely be destroyed by development plans if included. All the proposed development areas in and around Hildenborough include green belt land, "exceptional circumstances for development are not satisfied by house development needs when there are many other local brownfield sites available. Continued destruction of green land will lead to a local ecological collapse, just for some more houses.

This issue is relevant for all village areas.

We must preserve green belt and agricultural land

we must prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages

We must preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing on the fringes of the town

To reduce the use of greenbelt to build on.

Do not build in the Green Belt.

For health and well-being in maintaining the Rights of Way across the Green Belt and AONB for the benefit of future generations.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We need to preserve the green belt, and WFH and the internet has meant we need to repurpose town centres into more living areas rather than just shopping.

In order to minimise development in the Green Belt I am in favour of building at higher densities in the centre of urban areas. The density should then reduce as you get further from the centre. At the edge of the urban areas the

---

**User Response: Text**

density should drop in order to sympathetically meet the countryside.

Less need for cars if more people can access facilities on foot through living in the town centre.

Green Space should be protected

Green belts were established in England from 1955 to simply prevent the physical growth of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring cities and towns from merging. Do not built there.

Better infrastructure and it will preserve the green belt

Better infrastructure and it will preserve the green belt

To protect the greenbelt around Tonbridge and protect against urban sprawl.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

This would help to revitalise Tonbridge as a retail destination

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

---

**User Response: Text**

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge is a town and has facilities / infrastructure for a higher population. The greenbelt must be protected at all costs.

Affordable flats in town are what is needed

To protect the greenbelt around Tonbridge and protect against urban sprawl.

Tonbridge has the existing transport and community infrastructure required to support increased housing.

We believe the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) expects planning policies and decisions to promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes, however to maintain quality of life, physical & mental health of borough residents in Tonbridge & Malling, across Kent & save areas currently in decline such as Tonbridge - urban areas need to be the focus to get people to help with regeneration rather than adding to transport quadmire & causing gridlock.

Best use of finite urban & other brown field land for denser dwellings and reuse of/repurpose of existing buildings, should be promoted by T & M Council as oppose to wide spread executive housing (that benefits developers profits (& are NOT affordable?) on greenfield sites.

Must preserve green belt and agriculture areas

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

Minimise the need to build in the Green Belt.

Tonbridge has the facilities /infrastructure needed by a higher population.

If more housing is close to these facilities, public transport can be used rather than individual cars .

---

**User Response: Text**

The green belt must be protected - once it is gone it cannot be reclaimed.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi-storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (i.e Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

To maintain the quality of the character of the area.

Save green belt

Using up the brownfield areas within Tonbridge and not eat in to the Green Belt

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

---

**User Response: Text**

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Tonbridge is the principal town in the district and has fantastic train connections for trips outside the borough. The town has the infrastructure, schools, shops and services to allow sustainable development without the need for car travel and therefore beneficial to the environment and reducing the need to develop on green spaces which would impact the air quality, bio-diversity and quality of life for existing residents

Tonbridge has well established infrastructure, facilities and access. Only Ashford has a better connected rail station. Tonbridge can be developed as a major hub in Kent with a wide range of employment and social opportunities.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (+1,2,3A)

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To prevent the semi-rural and low-density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Reduce the continued demand for green field sites, once they are gone they are gone

I want the towns to be areas for development, not rural green spaces. We must improve the services for people who live in the town areas NOW before we build more housing.

---

**User Response: Text**

Reuse of existing built and brownfield sites will reduce the need to develop Green Belt. It will also reduce the risk of increasing carbon emissions by concentrating on areas where existing infrastructure can be improved which will benefit existing residents and businesses. Bus and rail links already exist, and can run more efficiently thereby contributing to carbon reduction.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

In order to minimise development in the Green Belt I am in favour of building at higher densities in the centre of urban areas

Making use of existing sites within an already existing development reduces the stress on an area so long as appropriate schools, surgeries, employment opportunity is developed alongside.

Keep development within existing built up areas

To protect Green belt.

We must preserve the green belt, best most valuable agricultural land.

Prevent the sprawl towards surrounding villages.

Preserve the semi-rural low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and

---

**User Response: Text**

carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Maximise use of existing infrastructure, more economical use of urban centre improvement costs, encourage and support shared accommodation and mixed use buildings, space and create greener more attractive spaces.

the main need is for smaller perhaps single person affordable accomodation and this can be provided in Tonbridge. Green land should not be built on and these sites wouldnt meet the needs for affordable housing and wouldnt have the infrastructure to support.

The demand for larger housing has been driven in recent years post Covid when London residents realised they could live in the Kent countryside and wtf 2 or 3 days a week. This is the immediate area we shoudl ffocus on or what current residents might want.

I do not agree that your only option is to build on green belt sites! Build on brown field sites - there are plenty of those!

This minimises the erosion of the green belt.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

---

**User Response: Text**

The Green Belt should be protected as far as reasonably possible.

There are plenty of housing sites in Tonbridge, why not use them?

Seems sensible. Many people like to live close to amenities and have the ability to walk to work or to the station. Not everyone wants a garden, although there could be gardens on the roofs of flats as well as solar panels. More residential development could mean regeneration of those town centres that are looking down-at-heel. Also, when there are more people walking about, especially at night, people feel safer.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.  
(= Grades 1, 2, 3A).  
To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.  
To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge has good transport links and supporting infrastructure to allow for more housing such as flats. I would add this should be done in moderation and not include high rise properties.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Improve areas that are already built up. Preserve green space.

improve already built up areas, preserve green space

A degree of space enhances living environments - building on significant, designed gaps significantly adversely impacts the quality of life aspects associated with developments

I want to protect Greenbelt and AONB areas.

No comments

This would hopefully stop the use of building on Green Belt Land. Tonbridge is a town and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood-proof development.



---

**User Response: Text**

Mixed-use development seems the way forward, especially with the decline of the traditional high street.

Green Belt land needs to be protected at all costs.

It obviously depends on the site and the actual plans for development but, wherever possible, we should make best use of existing brownfield sites in the town Centre to minimise the need to develop on green field sites, either within the town or on the edge of town

The Green Belt must be protected at all costs.

Sorry i do not feel qualified to make a judgement on Tonbridge sites as we only go there to shop have the odd meal and the go home

Tonbridge has fantastic links to London by train and get road links to the South East. This could become a new Sevenoaks or Tunbridge Wells but the problem is housing stock. There is need to develop good quality as well as a range of houses in/at the outskirts if Tonbridge which would create increased prosperity.

Increasing density within the town where services are available and making living within the town easier and more satisfactory will help everyone. Walking/cycling could be encouraged, reduce car journeys and therefore traffic, bring in investment to the town.

Continue to develop residential urban areas and keep some separation to the rural environments, if this is not done we will lose more countryside and there will be less and less rural areas leaving only built up communities.

As previously stated, east of T&MBC is suffering worse than any other part from over-development.

Therefore anything which reduces that, and if possible increases development inside an urban structure like Tonbridge is much better for the environment as a whole.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable agricultural land.

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Greenfield sites and green belt land should be maintained.

I believe we should be protecting green field, green belt and undeveloped land at all costs.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Higher build densities can be achieved in urban areas and town centres by building up, without the need to reduce floor space. It is inevitable over time that the demand for housing will encroach into the Green Belt but it must only be done once all other options have been fulfilled.

we need to preserve the greenbelt land

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roof for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent

---

**User Response: Text**

sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A)

Prevent sprawl towards neighbouring villages

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character if existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green belt and best most valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (+ Grades 1,2,3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages

To preserve the semi rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

So that we do not destroy Green Belt land that we might need for food production

Because it is essential to protect the Green Belt and AONB. Development within these areas would have a significant adverse effect on the natural beauty and resources within Tonbridge and Malling. It is important to protect, conserve and enhance this for future generations.

But please no high-rise (over 4 storeys) and please ensure parking. Also rooms should be a liveable size.

The Green Belt is there for a very good reason and you start to use it at your peril. If you do away with it, where will it stop? Hildenborough and Tonbridge are already joined as if one place. You can imagine Hadlow and Tonbridge becoming one large sprawl and I am certain that the inappropriate use of Green Belt for residential use is not the way forward at all. If I wanted to live in a super large housing estate I can sell up and move to Londonistan.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge is a town and therefore further development here will be more in keeping with that environment.

To release sites outside of Tonbridge risks changing the feel of these places- eg villages become more like towns. You need to preserve different types of area and respect that people chose to live in them for a reason. People choosing to live in a village do not want a town forced upon them.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

infrastructure and protecting the green belt

having adequate green space for agriculture and to mitigate loss of habitat for important plants and species which contribute to the health of people and the planet.

Building a single site multi story carpark hidden for view by residential development would free up considerable land for residential development and would allow the council as landowner to specify high quality social rented housing.

Green belt and agricultural land (grades 1,2,3A) must be preserved to limit climate change and provide for food security.

Urban sprawl and coalescence must be prevented to preserve character of location and infrastructure between villages and towns must be improved.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys+). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Save greenness. More people housed in the town, will bring life back to the town centre.

Preserve green belt land. Prevent areas sprawling into each other. Maintain the feel of existing housing on the edge of town

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

To reduce the impact on the green belt and natural environment, and improve sustainability. Tonbridge also has good provision of open space for leisure and other cultural activities.

If there are brown field sites in Tonbridge town centre and the immediate surrounding area, then this would be a good use of land. However, Tonbridge is regularly flooded so unless major work was undertaken to do something about this, then I do not see how more building would help. On the other hand, Tonbridge High Street has lots of potential and if there were more residents within walking or cycling distance, then retailers would benefit.

---

**User Response: Text**

Option 1 gives the opportunity to maximise use of brownfield sites, build to higher densities, and use existing infrastructure which will not only take the pressure off greenfield sites but also improve Tonbridge as a thriving and buoyant town. Improvements in air quality however must be considered and ensuring flood risk is avoided. Flash floods and higher levels in the Medway as sea level rises must be planned for.

To minimise encroachment on the Green Belt and impact on bio-abundance and biodiversity, avoid impairment of the landscape and heritage in and around our villages and avoid coalescence.

Tonbridge's facilities are badly in need of rejuvenation and that could be forced on developers if the town itself was improved in an intelligent and well planned fashion

To save development pressure on out of centre green field and green belt sites

I do not believe there are any reasonable grounds to ignore the importance of the greenbelt, especially given that there are options to build elsewhere.

This minimises the release of green field sites, which I would implore TMBC to do.

integrity of the Green Belt is key. Tonbridge is a fantastic town with a lot more potential - such as the recent riverside developments - for the benefit of the town and those in the new areas.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge can cope with more development better than Green Belt development.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

---

**User Response: Text**

This minimises the release of green field sites, which I would implore TMBC to do.

This minimises the release of green field sites, which I would implore TMBC to do.

In order to protect greenbelt land (there is real need to protect and increase biodiversity as one way to tackle the climate emergency) and land of high agricultural grade use - incredibly important that we do not decrease our food security any further by building on agricultural land, particularly grade 1.

Any strategy that preserves green belt has my vote. Need to prevent urban sprawl and merging with surrounding villages.

Repeating my earlier observations.

Retain the green belt

Reduce urban sprawl

Continue to use the farm land as intended and grow our own food

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Protect the Greenbelt and prevent urban sprawl

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenSeld

---

**User Response: Text**

sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Preserve AONB and GB.

The green belt and AONB must be preserved at all costs for cultural and environmental reasons that cannot be neglected.

It's a forced choice as Green Belt must be protected at all costs.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (5 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

The flood barrier protection of Tonbridge, a cash injection into a tired town, optimising heritage aspects such as the castle, improving housing stock, improved transport: bus routes, cycle routes, train services between linked towns.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.



---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge is a town and has facilities and infrastructure for high population

Please see previous comments

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

It is considered that Option 1 could have a significant impact on the townscape of Tonbridge through over-density, and the delivery of large quantities of housing that are not market-facing in the post-pandemic world.

There is of course a place for flats and redevelopment of brownfield land, but there needs to be opportunities for people to grow families within the principal town by delivering a mix of housing on greenfield sites that can deliver new services and facilities and enhance access to and the enjoyment of the countryside as part of development.

We would also highlight a concern that there may be significant pressures on less valuable uses to be redeveloped for residential – which could lead to the loss of jobs and services in the town through new development.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

To build Tonbridge community and retail commerce and protect Greenbelt for all to enjoy and of benefit to our climate.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Preservation of the Green Belt by concentrating residential and other built development where it currently is or otherwise outside the Green Belt. Any loss of the Green Belt and land used, or which could be used, for agricultural purposes would be severely detrimental to the interests of future generations.

Preservation of green belt/prime farmland

I strongly disagree that your only option is to build on green belt land that is simply untrue . Look to use other sites that do not entail destroying local villages and communities. Use old airfields and brown field sites. The green belt is sacred land and needs defending and preserving.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

In order to minimise development in the Greenbelt. Concentrate development where existing infrastructure allows.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi-storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

The focus should be on making the town the best it can be (ie filling vacant units, improving the green spaces etc) rather than expanding onto the Green Belt.

Preservation of the Green Belt by concentrating residential and other built development where it currently is or otherwise outside the Green Belt. Any loss of the Green Belt and land used, or which could be used, for agricultural purposes would be severely detrimental to the interests of future generations.

Tonbridge is sufficiently dense. The extension of development beyond the outer edge is more realistic.

Tonbridge needs more people to waken it up. It could be a vibrant town if more housing was invested in.

Stay away from the countryside

We need to keep our countryside

---

**User Response: Text**

Empty commercial sites within Tonbridge town centre should be used for development

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

I feel it is very important to [a] preserve the Green Belt and also the Best, Most Valuable [BMV] agricultural land [Grades 1,2,3A], [b] to prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages and [c] to preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

It's what I believe is required

WE CANNOT AND MUST NOT DEVELOP ON GREENFIELD SITES. This should be sacrosanct.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Tonbridge town centre is already over developed

I feel there is a balance to be struck, which necessitates some new housing outside of existing sites in Tonbridge, provided the infrastructure is in place. Surely there are brownfield sites for housing though? Why is it a case of Green Belt, or Cram more into the town?

In order to minimise development in the Green Belt I am in favour of building at higher densities in the centre of urban areas. The density should then reduce as you get further from the centre. At the edge of the urban areas the density should drop in order to sympathetically meet the countryside.

---

### User Response: Text

Green belt once lost will never be recovered and as we are about to enter climate change crisis we need to keep green spaces.

Development should not destroy the fabric of the town by extending further from the centre.  
Dense town centre / brownfield construction should be prioritised but nothing should detract from the castle which must remain the key focal point of the town.  
Buildings surrounding the castle, especially on the opposite riverbank should be sensitive to the historic monument that overlooks them.

Concentrating car parking onto one sites in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys).  
Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

I do not want any of the Green Belt to be taken away for the development of houses, businesses or public amenities., nor any of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to be encroached on.

I do not want any farming land to be used for housing because we will need to grow more of our own produce in the coming years, and these farm lands often abut the Green Belt and AONB.

Option 1. protects the historic nature of the villages within T&M

The surround countryside of Tonbridge is one of it's key attractions. outdoor activities are well provided for and encouraged in the large open spaces surrounding the town.

Keeping the towns in the towns and the countryside in the countryside will surely be less intrusive on those that prefer to live in either of those spaces. Supporting an expanded town will be less expensive and make pollution and emissions far easier to mitigate then spreading housing over villages that turn into towns. In short residents of both will be happier and so will climate change targets.

To help keep new properties closer to major towns with suitable roads and infrastructure to meet the demands of

---

**User Response: Text**

the growing population, and not building around small villages that will not cope with hundreds if not thousands of new residents

Because it is essential to protect the Green Belt and AONB. Development within these areas would have a significant adverse effect on the natural beauty and resources within Tonbridge and Malling. It is important to protect, conserve and enhance this for future generations.

I think it makes better sense to optimise densities at Tonbridge, rather than the higher costs associated with lots of little sites m- it's just inefficient

Increasing density reduces the need to build on green field sites with all the benefits of maintaining amenity for outdoor activity, for nature and for farming that the option brings

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Whilst the principle of making an efficient use of land is supported, building at higher densities can be to the detriment of ensuring a mix of types and tenures of housing is delivered – most often, that of family housing and affordable. Alongside ensuring development can deliver a mix of housing, it is also vital that in accordance with the NPPF, schemes are well-designed, attractive and create healthy places (paragraph 124). Therefore, whilst higher densities can be pursued in some circumstances (ie, in a town/city centre or around a transport hub(s)), it is not a one size fits all approach.

Further, and as evidenced elsewhere, development sites within urban locations/brownfield sites often involve long lead in times owing to site-specific delivery constraints, for instance, costs associated with remediation/difficulties with design. Consequently, this can impact the viability of development affecting the delivery of affordable housing. To the contrary, the development of homes on greenfield sites allows for family homes to be delivered with policy compliant levels of affordable housing and within shorter lead-in times. This is especially relevant given the affordable housing need of 283 dpa each year<sup>[1]</sup>.

It is also important to consider the impacts of COVID-19 which have driven the need for more space/outdoor areas/gardens. Indeed, this was supported through the Council's own household survey (with the findings within the Housing Needs Assessment (July 2022)) with 14.7% of respondents wanting more space (for home working

---

## User Response: Text

etc) and 11.9% looking for a property with a larger garden/outdoor space<sup>[2]</sup>.

It is therefore suggested that in the expectation for the requirement of residents wanting more space likely to remain, areas where higher densities are considered appropriate, need to be carefully considered. Thus, we suggest that it is Option 2 which should be taken forward through the Local Plan.

<sup>[1]</sup> Housing Needs Assessment (July 2022) – paragraph 5.12

<sup>[2]</sup> Housing Needs Assessment (July 2022) – paragraph 5.10

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

We must use brownfield sites where possible, a lot of the infrastructure is already in place and car there will be a reduction in the carbon footprint.

Tonbridge has the existing infrastructure to deal with more housing. We need to not build on greenbelt land, once its gone, its gone forever.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

---

**User Response: Text**

We don't see that as an 'either' 'or' option and we suspect that a balance between the two would benefit the area but we do not have sufficient local knowledge to comment further.

Protecting the green belt.

Make use of unused existing buildings for residential development to avoid destroying green belt and rural communities.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

In order to minimise development in the Green Belt I am in favour of building at higher densities in the centre of urban areas. The density should then reduce as you get further from the centre. At the edge of the urban areas the density should drop in order to sympathetically meet the countryside. The necessary infrastructure already exists in the urban areas making it easier to integrate housing.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield site approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield site approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; while improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Tonbridge town centre has benefitted from past restrictions on out-of-town retail development, meaning it now



---

**User Response: Text**

benefits from having major supermarkets in the centre of town (unlike many towns). This should be capitalised upon, so as to ensure a vibrant town centre for years to come. There is an opportunity to develop the Angel Centre and old Beales store.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Tonbridge is a town that has the infrastructure to support more development

Reduce the pressure on roads by keeping as much development as possible central

We must preserve the Greenbelt and prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surround villages

Better use of brownfield and existing sites within existing town boundaries should be the only option

Difficult choice, but we must try and maintain the green belt at the top of the priorities triangle.

Protection of green belt sites. Replace existing poor quality housing

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.

---

**User Response: Text**

(= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of green field sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brown field first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

My reasons for this are the same as my reasons for not building on any green sites already stated within this consultation

Rely on existing (albeit upgraded) infrastructure. Preserving green space.

The intensification option must be considered to be compliant with national guidance (on the reuse of previously developed land and before land is released from the Green Belt) but it will not deliver sufficient quantities of land to meet development needs. The intensification option is also likely to be limited in historic city and town centres where historic assets will need to be protected. It is also likely that there will be infrastructure capacity issues associated with significant levels of new development within existing settlements e.g. schools and health services already at capacity with limited scope to expand.

We have concerns as to what is meant by optimising densities on development sites as it does seem to be encouraging a “town cramming” approach and driving dwelling types toward smaller properties and flats. This does not reflect the housing need in the town.

---

**User Response: Text**

On the basis of the Housing Needs Study 2022, the overwhelming need in Tonbridge is for 3 and 4 bed houses and 1 and 2 bed bungalows – together these make up between 55-75% of the market housing and affordable (rented) needs.

As stated in our response to other questions, Tonbridge should be identified as a separate urban area at the top of the settlement hierarchy as it offers the greatest potential to accommodate development in a sustainable manner. As it is inevitable that Green Belt release will be required in the Borough, this should be at Tonbridge where the benefits will be most profound.

Land is available at for development at Tonbridge to support the Councils growth strategy. There is potential to deliver an integrated new community to the western edge. A phased approach can be taken to help deliver and sustain a rolling 5 year housing land supply in the early years of the plan.

Please see accompanying site specific documentation.

See response to Q2

Green spaces should not be built on

Any building on greenfield / green belt land has to as a last resort. These areas need to be maintained for future generations, wildlife and minimising pollution

It gives opportunities for younger and older people in live closer to essential facilities

If you would like to live in a town, please live in a town. If you have chosen to live in a village that is your choice. Please do not try and make a village into a town.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

1. Urban sites are clearly an important element in the overall strategy for the delivery of new housing.

---

**User Response: Text**

1. However, it is considered that it would not be appropriate to seek to 'cram' high density development onto such sites simply based on the aim of then reducing the need to develop Greenfield / Greenbelt sites.
1. This is because there is often a disconnect between optimistic density assumptions made in urban capacity studies and the actual reality of then achieving these through the development control process, particularly in the context of a drive for higher quality design, minimum space standards, amenity space requirements, urban greening etc.

4. It is considered that the more conservative density assumptions should therefore be adopted. This will prevent a situation occurring whereby the plan ultimately does not deliver the housing requirement as a result of urban sites not reaching higher aspirational densities when the reality of achieving these appropriately is assessed through detailed planning applications.

We have to save green spaces!!!

See response to Question 4.

We need to prevent urban sprawl

We need to optimise the existing buildings some of which are derelict or empty. Redevelop existing areas rather than spread into Green Belt.

Protecting the green belt and countryside is vital for the future

If there are aggressive targets to be met, it makes sense to concentrate on town centre and brownfield sites to minimise the need to develop on greenfields to the perimeter. Town centres are gradually reducing their relevance so changing use in an area that is likely to see reduced opposition would be an easy win.

To make best use of the facilities available in Tonbridge. Be flexible: depending on demand for retail space some of the marginal retail space could be re-purposed as housing.

Tonbridge needs more services as there is always plenty of housing/flats

I would support enhancement of the town such that the existing facilities may be used to best result. Expanding the Green Belt is considered to be of detriment.

---

### User Response: Text

In order to minimise development in the Green Belt I am in favour of building at higher densities in the centre of urban areas. The density should then reduce as you get further from the centre. At the edge of the urban areas the density should drop in order to sympathetically meet the countryside.

Higher density housing can be provided at a lower cost per unit and reduces the need to use greenfield sites. However this should not be balanced with the need to maintain our built heritage.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys).

Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best Most Valuable agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages, whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services and safe cycle lanes.

### Protection of Green Belt

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys).  
Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents

The green belt will be saved and the brownfields will be utilised

The Green Belt must be preserved.

---

**User Response: Text**

No Response

Brownfield/ previously developed sites should be used first.

Tonbridge can cope with the increases where the more rural areas plainly cant and would be ruined.

Sadly, Tonbridge is what it is - a commuter town which has grown larger due to the railway. It should not sprawl further and damage the surrounding rural communities.

No response

Many really good life features require high population densities. I always worry that one will get high population density without providing the benefits.

I live in Hildenborough and feel that the current schools, doctors and transport facilities do not support the addition of more development other than the Oakhill site and Care Home.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

See above comments on preference for brownfield sites.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Resource efficiency + economies of scale

To save our precious Green Belt

Maximise urban areas for location of any housing needs.

Building in Tonbridge town centre has already occurred over the last couple of decades with inadequate parking and knock on traffic issues. Further residential development in the centre can only make things worse.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

I would only support Option 1 if there is genuine investment in services and facilities. Currently they are not adequate (i.e. in terms of congestion, healthcare). But overall I support minimising urban sprawl. In building up Tonbridge there must be maintenance of access to green space (e.g. not giving over surrounding parkland for development)

To preserve green field sites and areas of natural beauty

Enhance and improve current town and urban areas

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure. However, flooding is an issue and this must be addressed first.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes wherever feasible and more cycle friendly road junction/lane layout where not.

An area with great road links (A21, A26) and regular rail services. It is still an area to aspire to and the growth would benefit the developed industrial and commercial areas already there.

Existing roads could be developed in regards to coping with the increase housing

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).



---

### User Response: Text

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We welcome the objective to encourage the re-use and redevelopment of previously-developed land. Such redevelopment should seek to preserve existing mature trees and protect existing habitats on biodiverse brownfield sites. High density housing should seek to accommodate trees along boundaries, paths and in areas of public space.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of green field sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brown field first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Whilst the principle of making an efficient use of land is supported, building at higher densities can be to the detriment of ensuring a mix of types and tenures of housing is delivered – most often, that of family housing and affordable. Alongside ensuring development can deliver a mix of housing, it is also vital that in accordance with the NPPF, schemes are well-designed, attractive and create healthy places (paragraph 124). Therefore, whilst higher densities can be pursued in some circumstances (ie, in a town/city centre or around a transport hub(s)), it is not a one size fits all approach.

Further, and as evidenced elsewhere, development sites within urban locations/brownfield sites often involve long lead in times owing to site-specific delivery constraints, for instance, costs associated with remediation/difficulties with design. Consequently, this can impact the viability of development affecting the delivery of affordable housing. To the contrary, the development of homes on greenfield sites allows for family homes to be delivered with policy compliant levels of affordable housing and within shorter lead-in times. This

is especially relevant given the affordable housing need of 283 dpa each year<sup>4</sup>.

It is also important to consider the impacts of COVID-19 which have driven the need for more space/outdoor areas/gardens. Indeed, this was supported through the Council's own household survey (with the findings within the Housing Needs Assessment (July 2022)) with 14.7% of respondents wanting more space (for home working etc) and 11.9% looking for a property with a larger garden/outdoor space<sup>5</sup>.

It is therefore suggested that in the expectation for the requirement of residents wanting more space likely to remain, areas where higher densities are considered appropriate, need to be carefully considered. Thus, we suggest that it is Option 2 which should be taken forward through the Local Plan.

My previous comments apply:

Q4. I do not believe that the Council is looking deeply and radically enough at the opportunities within Tonbridge

---

**User Response: Text**

Town Centre and particularly redeveloping existing commercial buildings and making the most of the abundance of airspace that is ready and waiting to be utilised. In my view that should be properly tested first because it is fully in accordance with NPPF policies, can be set within a vision that looks at least 30 years ahead and is a potential game changer on many fronts including making effective use of land, achieving appropriate densities, rejuvenating the town centre, adopting modern working practices, promoting sustainable transport, minimising reliance on the motor car and protecting the maximum amount of Green Belt Land.

Q11. The thrust of the policies should be to maximise land use within Tonbridge Town Centre; if you do that, you minimise the amount of housing that needs to be provided elsewhere, and that in turn minimises the impacts on the Green Belt (and the wider natural environment).

Too much green field sites have already lost. It has to stop !

But why Tonbridge? It is cut off by the lack of East/West transport links. I used to work in Tonbridge but haven't been there since I changed jobs over 20 years ago. I regularly go to Maidstone and Sevenoaks but would never dream of going to Tonbridge.

Tonbridge has great amenities and it's a bustling Town where I feel people would have access to everything on their doorstep. Plus if we can preserve the countryside it is only a short journey for residents of Tonbridge to come out and explore/enjoy/appreciate the Green Belt and AONB.

Town centres are already ruined. Rural areas like West Malling should be preserved. Kings Hill is already too big.

Preserving the green belt

I focused on the word optimise as I don't agree that all site should be dense.

Existing infrastructure and protecting green belt

Option 1 minimises impact on Green Belt and AONB which is so important to character of the area - retains something for new and existing residents.

The NPPF states it must be demonstrated that all other reasonable options have been fully examined before an exceptional case can be made for using Green Belt land. Given that the Green Belt Study says (p5, para 2.2) there is no formal definition or criteria on exceptional circumstances, is it possible for anyone to be confident that all

---

**User Response: Text**

reasonable options have been fully examined?

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents. We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible. We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.

---

**User Response: Text**

(= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Housing in Tonbridge would make use of brownfield sites. Keeping green belt gives everyone the opportunity to enjoy nature rather than endless housing estates.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park would free up space for residential use.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land.

(= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

---

**User Response: Text**

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A). To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

- To preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 1,2,3A)
- To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.
- To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

The urban area of Tonbridge does not have one uniform density. Whilst the NPPF is supportive of making effective use of land, Para 124 identifies that there are 5no. elements to establishing an appropriate density of development for a Site. These include: the identified need for different types of housing; local market conditions and viability; desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting; and, the importance of securing well-designed places. As such, whilst high density development might be suitable for Tonbridge town centre, this is less likely to be the case in the more suburban areas of the town. Consequently, there will be a limit to the capacity of urban sites for delivering housing.

The Urban Capacity study found a total of 31no. sites which have the potential to deliver 1,102 dwellings on the basis of maximised development densities of up to 123dph. It is unlikely that all the identified sites would be able to deliver at a density of 123dph when considering site constraints and all other matters that factor into determining appropriate development densities detailed in NPPF Para 124. This notwithstanding, the delivery of circa 1,000no. new homes would not be sufficient to substantially address the full housing needs for the Tonbridge area. Releasing land adjacent to the urban area will therefore be required to provide new housing to meet housing needs over the Plan Period to ensure places are well designed and sustainable.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

It is important the consequences of these two densification options are not just presented in terms of a perceived negative impact associated with release of green field / Green Belt land. Whilst we generally support the optimisation of urban densities, it is important the public are briefed on the consequences of this for their urban areas, including to the character of such areas, and for infrastructure capacity, open space, air quality and associated factors. It is also important to ensure the consequences of releasing green field / green belt land is not just presented as a negative option. It is important to optimise the use of urban areas, but acknowledge as the Council have elsewhere in the draft Local Plan, that these cannot meet all of the

---

**User Response: Text**

boroughs needs in a sustainable manner. This includes for example the need for family housing, which is harder to address through the densification of urban areas. It is also important to note greenfield / belt sites are also more likely to be able to deliver new public recreational spaces and other infrastructure, which in some instances is generally harder to deliver in urban areas where densification is the goal and space and viability prohibits.

Rydon does not have a view at this time.

Option 1 gives the opportunity to maximise use of brownfield sites, build to higher densities, and use existing infrastructure which will not only take the pressure off greenfield sites but also improve Tonbridge as a thriving and buoyant town. Improvements in air quality however must be considered and ensuring flood risk is avoided. Flash floods and higher levels in the Medway as sea level rises must be planned for.

Option 1 gives the opportunity to maximise use of brownfield sites, build to higher densities, and use existing infrastructure which will not only take the pressure off greenfield sites but also improve Tonbridge as a thriving and buoyant town. Improvements in air quality however must be considered and ensuring flood risk is avoided. Flash floods and higher levels in the Medway as sea level rises must be planned for.

Green belt must be protected. Development within walking distance of Tonbridge rail station as well as services and retail with reduced traffic.

Strategic options for Tonbridge are matters for Tonbridge residents.

The sustainability benefits of Option 1 are recognised, though this is not as deliverable option owing to land availability. Thus the most sustainable option is a combination of both Options 1 and 2, to ensure modest densities and appropriate Green Belt release.

There are a limited number of brownfield sites available in existing settlements in most LPA areas and it is inevitable that greenfield land will need to come forward, including land released from the Green Belt, to deliver the homes and other forms of development needed in any given area. TMBC is a borough constrained by a considerable area of green belt, notably around Tonbridge which is the only tier 1 settlement and main town in the borough. Thus, for Tonbridge to grow and become more sustainable, green belt land must be released.

Site 59764 does not contribute to the 5 purposes of the green belt and provides a prime opportunity for land release where it can secure real and tangible benefits for the community and town. This position is supported by the fact that site 59764 was draft allocated in the withdrawn emerging Local Plan. Importantly, the SOS's decision that the plan was unsound did not relate to the site's allocation.

---

**User Response: Text**

Option 1 is in line with government guidelines, associated with the uplift due to the high house price / earnings ratio in the borough.

Option 1 is in line with government guidelines, associated with the uplift due to the high house price / earnings ratio in the borough.

Option 1, whilst recognising that this will still not meet housing needs for the West Kent HMA, and therefore there must be Green Belt release at suitable locations adjacent to Tonbridge and the rural service centres in this part of the borough.

As set out in previous questions, Tonbridge is the largest and most sustainable settlement in the West Kent HMA within the borough. It is therefore right that densities of suitable land in Tonbridge should be appropriately high, to make best use of land.

However, as demonstrated in the UCS, there is not sufficient available land to accommodate housing need in the West Kent HMA within Tonbridge. Accordingly, even with increased densities there will remain the need for development at the edge of Tonbridge, and the other larger and more sustainable settlements in the western part of the borough: i.e. the RSCs including Hadlow. Land at Maidstone Road, Hadlow and Goldings Yard, Stocks Green Road TMBC reference 59615 represent such suitable sites. In accordance with paragraph 141 a) and b) of the NPPF it will be important for TMBC to demonstrate that density of development has been optimised at Tonbridge prior to Green Belt release.

Recognising the above, it is nevertheless of vital importance that the maximisation of densities is not at the expense of protecting the townscape of Tonbridge (including important designated heritage assets), and must reflect both the flooding constraints and the air quality issues within the centre of Tonbridge.

Accordingly, Fernham Homes preferred strategy is Option 1, whilst recognising that this will still not meet housing needs for the West Kent HMA, and therefore there must be Green Belt release at suitable locations adjacent to Tonbridge and the RSCs (including Hadlow) in this part of the borough.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

---

**User Response: Text**

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A).

To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages.

To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town

My preferred option is **OPTION 1** - to optimise existing areas of development without the need to release GREEN BELT sites.

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure. However, flooding is an issue and this must be addressed first.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for a high population. Design flood proof development

All these schemes are knee jerk reactions. The need for further research into human resources needs to be investigated and a better plan thought through.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Option 1: Maximise build densities on development sites within Tonbridge, particularly on those sites within the town centre, maximising their potential. This would minimise the need for the release of green field sites beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, in the Green Belt, for development.

Option 2: Keep build densities as they are. 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.

In order to minimise development in the Green Belt I am in favour of building at higher densities in the centre of urban areas. The density should then reduce as you get further from the centre. At the edge of the urban areas the density should drop in order to sympathetically meet the countryside.



---

**User Response: Text**

Preserve green belt and BMV agricultural land. Prevents urban sprawl of towns preserve low density character of the town.

Green belt and agricultural land must be preserved. Resist encroachment into outlying villages.

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure.

Using redundant retail space for housing.

As described above, minimise Green Belt development.

Use space available in town first before encroaching on current open areas.

This option builds on an existing urban location.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development.

While there has been substantial residential development in some parts of Tonbridge centre in recent years, there remain some sites that still could and should be enhanced. So much of Tonbridge town centre comprises open-air car parking.

Optimising densities in the centre is preferable to sacrificing green belt and promoting urban sprawl. That said, optimising densities should not be interpreted as ruining the town with tower blocks. Four storeys should be a maximum. We urge the planners to take account of how developments impact on views across the town from vantage points like the castle and seek to mitigate these with design constraints.

A good contribution to the situation would be multi storey car park (s) screened by other buildings to free up the large areas of car parks in the centre for development.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population but need to Design flood proof development

---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure. However, flooding is an issue there, and this must be addressed first.

We must preserve green belt and agricultural land to preserve semi rural land

My preferred option is **OPTION 1** - to optimise existing areas of development without the need to release Green Belt sites.

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure. However, flooding is an issue there, and this must be addressed first.

optimise densities on sites within Tonbridge, minimising the need for the release of Greenfield and greenbelt sites outside of Tonbridge.

Tonbridge is a town and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population.

Neither of these options appear to recognise that the significant existing infrastructure/highways pressures/constraints that the town currently faces, as discussed above. We believe, as previously stated (see Q.11), that the Local Plan should adopt strategic polices that should first look to focus development away from areas with severe capacity issues and/or have significant constraints. For the case of a more sustainable allocation of development in Tonbridge, e.g. if a lower housing requirement was adopted (given the out-dated ONS figures that overestimate this need, see Q.12), then we would slightly favour: Option 1: Optimise densities on development sites ... This would minimise the need for Green Belt land release, as advocated in our comments above. However, as stated above (in Q.19), we are concerned about the potential of over-development of our town, due to the significant existing infrastructure/highways pressures/constraints.

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Question 27

---

**User Response: Text**

What should be the main role of Tonbridge Town Centre moving forward? Should the priority be for shopping or for leisure, social and cultural uses or a balance of these? (max. 6000 characters)

Tonbridge should concentrate on its strengths as an attractive place to visit for shopping and leisure activities. Tonbridge should look at other successful towns of a similar size and situation. Lewes for example has become an attractive destination for visitors and residents as independent specialist businesses have thrived and people travel in to use them and other retailers benefit from secondary spend. There should be a balance of shopping, leisure, social, educational and cultural facilities.

Planning should consider young people. The current high street shops are unappealing for young people who travel outside the borough to shop. They also travel to Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells for cinemas, bars, dance venues, bowling etc. This deprives the local economy of a lucrative source of revenue. The town is more likely to thrive if it is made more vibrant and aesthetically appealing to teenagers and young adults. We have excellent schools for 11yr-18yr olds in the town, and yet this population is poorly served. If they enjoyed the town, rather than going to neighbouring towns for shopping and entertainment, this may generate a greater sense of town pride and a willingness to live, work and serve the local community.

Tonbridge must develop its offer as an historic tourist destination within Kent. The town has a very impressive calendar of events, many held on the council's own property assets, and these attract people in to support the local economy. We need to work harder to attract visitors to stay for a weekend or longer and use Tonbridge as a base to explore the wider region.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

**Option 1**

Optimise densities on development

sites within Tonbridge, particularly on

those sites within the town centre, maximising their potential for residential and mixed-use development.

**Consequence for the need for additional development land**

Minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, in the Green Belt, primarily for residential development

**Option 2**

Conservative densities on development sites within Tonbridge, minimising the intensification of existing built-up areas for residential and mixed-use development. primarily for residential development.

**Consequence for the need for additional development land**

Increase the need for the release of greenfield sites at and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, in the Green Belt, primarily for residential development.

---

**User Response: Text**

Select up to 1 option.

**Option 1 - Optimise densities on development sites within Tonbridge, particularly on those sites within the town centre, maximising their potential for residential and mixed-use development.**

Option 2 - Conservative densities on development sites within Tonbridge, minimising the intensification of existing built-up areas for residential and mixed-use development.

Question 26

What are your reasons for selecting this particular strategy option for Tonbridge (outline briefly (max. 6000 characters)?

Concentrating car parking onto one site in a multi storey car park hidden from view by a residential development (and with green roofing for aesthetics and carbon capturing) would make sense and free up considerable space for residential use which would be highly sustainable. If we are to minimise the need for the release of greenfield sites in and beyond the outer edge of Tonbridge, we need to build at a reasonably high density (4 storeys). Creating a town square between the High Street and a secondary retail area would enable a community space for the use of nearby residents.

We must preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) agricultural land. (= Grades 1, 2, 3A) and a brownfield first approach where we seek increased densities in areas where that is already the case is sensible.

We need to prevent urban sprawl encroaching on surrounding villages; whilst improving infrastructure between villages and larger towns with regular bus services, and safe cycle lanes.

Minimise need for release of greenfield sites.

To preserve Green Belt and BMV agricultural land grades 1, 2, 3,a

To prevent sprawl of surrounding villages

To preserve semi rural and low density character of existing housing estates on fringe of town

Tonbridge is a town and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population.

There needs to be a balance between the two. We don't want too much high rise development.

Tonbridge is already equipped to deal with expansion. We don't have the required infrastructure to maintain the current population.

---

**User Response: Text**

In addition to the options presented at Question 3 of the consultation document, the SA (at pages 94 to 100) sets out two alternative options for development in Tonbridge (as cross-referenced at pages 54 to 55 of the Consultation Document).

The first of these options considers the potential to optimise development densities within the Tonbridge Urban Area, whilst the second considers the impacts of applying policies to restrict densities and intensification within the Town.

Option 1 has the advantage of maximising the number of new homes that can be secured, through the use of previously developed sites, within the largest town within the Borough. This will give rise to sustainability benefits, as is correctly recognised in the SA's scoring (at pages 96 and 97 of that document).

However, the Urban Capacity Study Report (July 2022) indicates that a total of 1,946 dwellings could potentially be provided on identified urban sites across the Borough. Of these 1,102 dwellings could potentially be secured through the redevelopment of sites within Tonbridge (including Hilden Park).

Therefore, the potential contribution of housing supply from PDL sites (across the Borough) represents just 12.2% of the total housing need identified over the Plan-period (15,941). This also assuming that every previously developed site can be successfully brought forward, which is unlikely in practice - when taking account of highways impact / network capacity considerations, etc. It is apparent then, a strategy of densification in Tonbridge is not capable of addressing the scale of housing growth that the Local Plan has to address.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

We MUST preserve Green Belt and Best, Most Valuable (BMV) - Grades 1, 2 & 3A agricultural land. To prevent sprawl towards surrounding villages. To preserve the semi-rural and low density character of existing housing estates on the fringes of the town.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure. However, flooding is an issue and this must be addressed first.

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure. However, flooding is an issue and this

---

**User Response: Text**

must be addressed first.

Tonbridge is a town and has facilities and infrastructure for higher population.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof developments.

Tonbridge is a town with the required infrastructure.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

My preferred option is **OPTION 1** - to optimise existing areas of development without the need to release GREEN BELT sites.

Green belt that includes agriculture land must not be used for housing development. It is for farming, particularly now there is a world food shortage.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. To retain the character and landscape of the borough.

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Tonbridge is a town, and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population. Design flood proof development

Tonbridge is a town with infrastructure and facilities existing for large community.

optimise densities on sites within Tonbridge, minimising the need for the release of Greenfield and greenbelt sites outside of Tonbridge.

---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge is a town and has the facilities and infrastructure for high population.

To preserve green belt & most valuable (BMV) agricultural land grades 1, 2, 3A & prevent urban expansion towards other areas.

To keep any building at a minimum unless absolutely required.

Answer: In order to minimise development in the Green Belt I am in favour of building at higher densities in the centre of urban areas. The density should then reduce as you get further from the centre. At the edge of the urban areas the density should drop in order to sympathetically meet the countryside.

Tonbridge is a town and has more facilities and a better infrastructure.

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:13:31. Total records: 583

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 29] Do you have other thoughts about how planning poli...

### User Response: Text

Development should be sensitive built on local intelligence including infrastructure and services

No

Expansion of retail warehouses, light industrial units and manufacturing premises on the outskirts of town to provide employment.

Focus on developing the centre. I would support higher rise accommodation in the centre, condensing retail to areas that are already retail and develop car parking for the same. Free up the other ends of retail areas for development into housing. The same goes for industrial estate. It seems glaringly obvious that we have pressure to increase housing (whether we agree it is needed or not) but we have so much unused or poorly designed retail and industrial space. For example: the site of Sainsburys and empty Beales, sat in an island of parking. Blitz it, condense it and build housing around it. Use the same approach for other areas already concreted.

Refer to Q27 and 28

The Council must put forward its own land to help meet housing need and propose a holistic approach to the redevelopment of the car parks in the town centre. New public spaces like a town square, cinema and other leisure facilities alongside new homes would be a welcome addition to the town; the road network must be improved alongside this to reduce congestion.

Redevelop the Angel Centre to make it a cultural, leisure and administrative hub for the Council.

Tonbridge has the opportunity to maximise its key assets of the river and the castle.

Attract the right people to come, and make sure they find it welcoming and safe and enjoyable. Then retail opportunities and the locals with disposable income will follow. So that's the order to do things in.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

High quality design and flood mitigation. Green materials and eg soak away driveways etc

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there.

---

**User Response: Text**

Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

More time give to turning empty office, shop and industrial areas into homes before building on new areas

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A town square could be created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

No

Tonbridge is a unique historic town and its character should be protected against any development that would detract from that.

Where does it state that this can be resisted. Or what any criteria to resist based on existing overcrowding and or congested infrastructure.

Yes leave the area as it is

Make more use of the assets we have, such as the castle, to increase revenue and tourism. Build the hotel you were supposed to.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsbury's car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

See answer to question 28

No

---

**User Response: Text**

No

More affordable housing. More car parking for Tonbridge train station.

With town centres struggling for footfall and already urbanised centres surely it makes sense to utilise the space to become residential areas

Tonbridge has the opportunity to maximise its key assets of the river and the castle.

Yes. Allowance should be made for reconfigurable buildings between commercial and residential uses. And there should be more emphasis on aesthetically pleasing design.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

n/a

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

See previous answers.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Not able to comment.

It is vital to rejuvenate the centre of many towns and Tonbridge is typical of that general need.

It's excellent transport links to London mean that there is a tangible need for housing and this ticks many boxes in putting houses up where there is need and where travel to commuting hubs is easy and limited

---

**User Response: Text**

I am mortified that our family home with beautiful green fields surrounding it is at risk of developing a huge unneeded housing estate

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Sadly, the ample car parking is important. It is probably why people use our town more than others.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Acceptable if additional locations also receive investment and improved infrastructure.

A mix of dwelling styles, don't compromise or build on any of the green space and focus on regeneration of any brownfield sites

Plans to develop the Angel Centre should be reopened to create a leisure hub with a cinema and more restaurants too

There has been a significant risk of flooding in Tonbridge historically. It will be important to ensure that further development does not increase the risk of future flooding.

Planning policy should allow for reasonable flexibility to ensure that Tonbridge town centre remains vibrant and attractive. At the same time, policy should aim to protect the function of the town centre as the primary retail destination.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the

---

**User Response: Text**

town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

No

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsbury's car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The church has many areas of land throughout the country , much of it sacred but which could be considered to be brown field, where small groups of rented starter homes could be built . For example the two parish churches in Tonbridge have large graveyards where if the interned remains were moved to a single largest grave within the site there would be space for say 200dwellings or more . Ancient burial sites in the capital are are moved to make way for infrastructure and developments as outlined above would be a source of income for the various church organisation struggling with attendances.

Such a change in government policy although difficult to implement would make a major impact on the need for the housing needs of the whole country.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The condition of the shops outside the station must be addressed.

The council should be mindful that a large contributing factor for the rise in popularity of the out of town shops (eg Cannon's lane) is that you do not have to pay for parking. The high cost of parking elsewhere in the town detracts shoppers from using the high street as an unnecessary additional expenditure. This in turn hurts our local businesses.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Nat applicable

---

**User Response: Text**

All new developments should be initially supported by 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.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsbury's car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The condition of the shops outside the station must be addressed.

It should take into consideration climate change and sustainability

reduce retail footprint. far too many stores and car parks occupy plots that could be used to house people.

no more large retail stores- get the big chain supermarkets to build smaller local stores with restriceted number of car park bays.

decentralise food shopping.

reduce car park capacity overall.

reduce flow of cars lorries down the high st.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Na

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

More boutique shops and less chain or charity shops. Pedestrianise the high st.

---

**User Response: Text**

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a ***top priority*** in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

We need to ensure there isn't over development and over crowding in any aspects of our borough.

Build on Brown belt sites and not wait for several years to planning applications to go through.

Should be a development focus.

Maintain a dialogue with residents so that they feel a part of the solution, thereby accepting changes

N/A

A redesign of the area around the Angel centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town - to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Consolidate a large number of existing car park and utilise multi-storey car parks or underground parking, thus freeing up land for development.

---

**User Response: Text**

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Perhaps convert some more of the office buildings into residential? This has already started within Tonbridge High Street.

Develop the old Beales site as this is currently unused and is an eyesore.

remIning sites in Tonbridge might be best off being reserved mostly for those used that need access to town but don't likely have cars. Retirement villages spring to mind. Plus facilities, retail (but not supermarkets) etc. Parking should move out of the centre with an expectation that visitors can walk a few hundred metres. That would in turn help traffic. The angel centre site would be a great outdoor facility, maybe al fresco restaurants, sports facilities, a park (not playground) if it wasn't a huge parking lot. Personally I think some if the industrial sites are unfortunate in the town centre again introducing traffic without clear benefit of a town centre location.

A re-design of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The plan should seek to reduce and even eliminate traffic in the town centre.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

It should address climate change/sustainability

Housing in the town centre has its place, however it is important that shops and offices are not converted into residential property, as once this is lost it is almost impossible to bring back. Empty offices and shops should be used for community activity if they are surplus for use as retail or office.



---

**User Response: Text**

Pedestrianisation areas and town squares are often desirable aspects, this may encourage artisan markets (which should be held weekly to allow people to buy freshly for their weekly shop). Parking spaces remain important to encourage people out of town with little public transport infrastructure to be able to make use of Tonbridge. Green Park Market in Bath is a good example of a successful weekly market where people from far and wide come to buy their weekly shop directly from producers.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Bring some green spaces back making it more of the market town it was.

Prioritise independent businesses rather than chains.

no

No

Convert unused office buildings into Residential.

None presently

Re Tonbridge future development, the views of those living closest in and around the town centre should have the biggest say and carry the greatest weight.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

---

**User Response: Text**

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Develop the car park sites and high street. provide car parking in multistorey. reduce reliance on the car by improved networks of electric run transport systems, out of town parking

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

There should be no housing targets from central government and a real want to protect Tonbridge green spaces as a priority for the environment as mass building has a big carbon footprint.

Planning policy is limit the amount of greenfields that is released for development. and the policy should be following, policy should be detailed and comprehensive, and not to cause any confusions.

Yes, empty shops does nothing for the town's environment. Also empty spaces above shops should be developed into affordable housing

The closure of Beales was a hammer-blow to the town and it is a disgrace that this site is still empty. What a missed opportunity.

Too much of the centre of Tonbridge is taken up by outdoor parking such as at Sainsbury's and Sovereign Way. Multi-stories would release space for leisure, social and cultural activities. Tonbridge town centre has no green spaces or parks. There can't be many towns of Tonbridge's size that don't have green spaces or parks

I think some mixed use development in the high street where independent shops and businesses can provide services with character and also spaces to meet that are not just cafes. For example, the common room <https://www.thecommonroom.life/>. Also maker spaces <https://makerversity.org/> where people with skills can get together to co-work and co-create. Neighbouring Tunbridge Wells has some excellent examples of independent businesses that attract people to go there to enjoy the creative businesses and restaurants.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

---

**User Response: Text**

Use previously built on sites.

Redesign of Angel Centre/Sainsbury's should be considered.

Development Briefs for a particular area are helpful in guiding and setting parameters for what type and form of development may come forward.

Don't build 'Toy Towns' build sympathetically.

Take a leaf out of King Charles' Poundbury, Dorset development

The Angel Centre should be remodeled to provide a wider range of leisure activities for all ages. It should also cater for the older generation and become more of a community hub.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

See my previous answer.

Shops and offices once converted into residential property, are difficult to get back, as a result. Empty offices and shops should be used for community activity. If they should be converted to housing they should be bought by the local authority and sold as leases so that in future should the need be required, they can be converted back into commercial.

Parking spaces remain important to encourage people out of town to make use of Tonbridge. Pedestrian areas are important to encourage a greater sense of place as opposed to just another road.

I think Tonbridge has been "developed" enough, just make it more attractive to visitors with decent rates that retailers can afford to avoid empty shops and keep it clean and well policed.

no development on Green belt land, develop brown field sites.

Mixture of commercial, retail, and residential use. It is important to avoid units being empty for long periods.

---

**User Response: Text**

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

As above, centrally located industrial sites should be replaced with attractive, dense housing units. A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike. Any development should be eco-friendly design.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

All plans for the town's future, should have the objective of raising the appeal as an attractive centre.

no

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Climate change and sustainability should be addressed

Could more thought be given to restricting the amount of non-High Street development, e.g the retail park on Cannon Lane? While the High Street cannot accommodate large retail units (save for the ex-Beales site) surely some of the smaller Cannon Lane units could have gone to the High Street. More non-town centre retail development will hasten the demise of the high street / town centre. It is important that adequate parking is retained, alongside greener transport initiatives, to continue supporting the High Street.

No

---

**User Response: Text**

Industrial units are a necessity but they should all have solar panels on their roofs to help reduce demand or even give back to the National Grid. Must better than giving over farm land for solar panels.

Ensure that the Grade 1 amenities and 'feel' that this town centre enjoys is preserved at all cost.

Local museum and green garden spaces on Angel Centre site, to promote the history of the town and importance of river.

Move the Angel Centre to area near Swimming Pool

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A town square could be created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

ask the people who live there.

Tonbridge was always a nice place to shop. Not too busy, laid back, with good cheap-to-higher end options.

---

**User Response: Text**

The loss of shops and Beale's has been a blow which need to be restored. Bigger name shops need to be enticed back, along with eateries and activity options.

At present, the High Street is a shell.

Converting disused shops for new housing would preserve the old character of the town but provide new homes.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to make the town more dynamic and attractive to both residents and visitors.

n/a

No response

See above

The Town Centre Action Area requires a detailed master plan including 3d spatial massing, to direct development towards specific outcomes. It will require a development agency to negotiate between land owners and stake holders. If the Local authority lack the resources to deliver this master plan, then a competition should be held to find the best ideas and vision. Strong leadership is required and this will have to be based on a clear mandate from local residents and stakeholders. The central development of Tonbridge is the greatest opportunity for the local authority to meet the challenges of the housing provision within the Local Plan in a truly visionary and sustainable manner. It should make Tonbridge the place where everyone want to live and work, not just a 2nd rate Tunbridge Wells or a place just a bit further along the line from Sevenoaks.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

TMBC should reference the conservation area and other area assessments it commissioned and published in 2008-9 . This is a body of work providing detailed guidance for planning throughout the historic parts of the town. TMBC should also compile a list of locally important buildings -- perhaps based on that drawn up by Tonbridge Civic Society . The Council should also be more ambitious and draw up local conservation policies of its own rather than simply relying on national planning policy.

Something obviously needs to be done about the Sainsburys/Beales /Angel Centre area . It is quite ridiculous that the former Beales -- one of the few large retail units in the town -- is vacant As mentioned earlier, this whole

---

**User Response: Text**

area should be redeveloped with some of the car parking shifted to a multi storey car park and a town square created , which Tonbridge lacks.

Something needs to be done about the ghastly scruffy Railway approach which is a deeply depressing entry point to the High Street. The existing two-tier car park opposite makes matters worse.

**Above all Tonbridge suffers from lack of a town council or some other representative body headed by a person whose job is focus on the changes needed and steer them forward and champion the town in the face of challenges from elsewhere in the borough seeking to make our town a dumping ground for the borough's problem of meeting housing needs.**

Land uses and developments must respect the scale and historic features of the town which many recent developments do not.

No

The planning should take into consideration the climate and sustainability

Only as above

It should address climate change/ sustainability

No response

Park and ride?

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Should aim to enhance the town's appearance as currently it feels very disjointed between upper and lower high

---

**User Response: Text**

street. Also should aim to make better use of the river, e.g. developing parallel to the river to maximise leisure and social use, rather than perpendicular.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

see above

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

keep it attractive and small not for major development

look at recently approved Harlow Town Centre development

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Do something about the old Beales site.

no comment



---

**User Response: Text**

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the high street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road but still ensuring sufficient parking available for residential properties and the rest of the visiting population and locals wishing to shop etc. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway approach brought back to use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving the station at all 3 entrances, would enhance the towns appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors.

See Q27 answer above.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Use the old office blocks etc to repurpose the town centre into a living areas with a mix of shops, restaurants and social services.

No

The planning should take into consideration the climate and sustainability

The planning should take into consideration the climate and sustainability

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

No

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

---

**User Response: Text**

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsbury's car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

It should address climate change / sustainability where and whenever possible. re: Flood Proof development.

Close off the High Street and concentrate retail together. Affordable housing in the rest.

No

Ensure a holistic approach ensuring amenities match development such there is not overcrowding due to under capacity for example transport infrastructure & congestion, sewerage processing (to avoid floods & discharge into the river Medway) Schools, minimising pollution etc.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

No

It should address climate change/sustainability where and whenever possible.

Flood proof development is obviously very important

The Angel Centre and Sainsbury's site needs to be completely reworked and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf. This would retain some local distinction and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be re-imagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, thus increasing tourist revenue. It would also bring about a sense of pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the community and levels of safety.

I am sorry, I view this as beyond my concern as I reside nearer Maidstone.

---

**User Response: Text**

Better transport and rail links, but not empty bike lanes

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

No.

A Town Centre Plan would be appropriate to ensure development is planned to encourage economic growth and provide what is needed for the growing population.

Consider more high rise buildings for dwelling and offices in Tonbridge allowing expansion 'upwards' in the town rather than spreading 'outwards' into the rest of the borough. This is a typical strategic approach for large urban hubs.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainbury's car park is a top priority in order to develop the

---

**User Response: Text**

town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The quality of future development must be controlled through the implementation of strong management policies to ensure that all developments are to a high quality, include all possible renewable energy systems, deliver high quality built environments and infrastructure, maintain the current nature of the historic town, retain, improve and increase the green spaces and tree planting

No

Tonbridge's history as a major railway development town should be at the heart of the policy. Its past is somehow getting lost with its modernisation. By comparison, West Malling has a really well preserved historic centre and is an attractive destination to visit. The planners have let Tonbridge's heritage be obliterated whereas it has a lot of Victorian history and of course has its Norman castle and lovely bifurcated river.

The area by the Angel centre could be utilised better .

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore.

The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

---

**User Response: Text**

Yes, very much so. But this questionnaire is impossibly long and I am running out of time and enthusiasm. I should say that I have wiped out all my long answers by mistake !! Contact me if you want more.

BUT, IN SHORT, THE DEVELOPMENT, BUILDING AND INVESTMENT SECTORS ONLY OCCASIONALLY DRIVE IMAGINATIVE CHANGE AND THEREFORE YOUR PLANNING POLICY MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR A MORE FLEXIBLE APPROACH IN ORDER TO RESPOND TO WHAT WILL BE RAPIDLY CHANGING DEMANDS - JUST LOOK AT THE INFLUENCE OF 'GENERATION Z' ALREADY.

No.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

There should be a rethink of the Angel Centre area. The arcades from the High Street should lead into a more human-friendly space. At the moment it's all about parking cars. Why not make the parking two-tier and put it at the back of the existing buildings. Put in a green space with many more trees where people can sit and chat or children play. A sculpture trail. A performance area to encourage open air concerts or open air exhibitions. Other towns have cultural centres – why not Tonbridge? Do something creative with the rear view of the High Street shops.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Need employment opportunities as well as infrastructure and resources to balance the increased number of housing being built

need employment opportunities, infrastructure and public transport to balance houses being built

---

**User Response: Text**

Multi storey car parks to attract shoppers and evening visitors. This would have the effect of reducing the amount of land required for car parking and freeing up land for development. Further, the town centre should be used to attract visitors in the evening through restaurants, evening entertainment (night clubs) as well as the existing Town public houses.

No comments

I think cycle infra-structure should be looked at as a priority

The High Street should be pedestrianised to stimulate growth / tourism etc. This has worked well in similar sized centers (Newbury, Winchester etc.) and these centers are beautiful, well supported and flourishing. Some original thinking could solve the 'by-pass' issue.

No

no not really as i do not live there the local people should be involved in that

N/a

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Increase density/heights with good quality design to minimise impact on green areas.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike. More trees please and innovative planting schemes to enhance surroundings

There is a move to on-line shopping that is going to impact most town centres. In my view town centres will become service centres and entertainment centres if they are going to survive and planning policy should take account of this and facilitate it in the future.

avoid building on green belt, include infrastructure in the planning stages and not as an afterthought

---

**User Response: Text**

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to make the time more dynamic and more attractive to residents and visitors alike

Addressing climate change should be at the core of development proposals. New development should be within walking or cycling distance to existing stations.

See above - make it easier to get around and attractive to visit. Don't punish people for visiting (parking fees rises etc). It's revenue to you but it's not attractive to come into Tonbridge I'd rather go elsewhere. Don't tear down our heritage to throw up square boxes and generally start to work with the residents to make planning work for everyone. Hopefully you can meet targets but also make the place attractive to live and visit.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on

---

**User Response: Text**

Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside multi story parking, retail, leisure and new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing High Street.

The space around the railway station needs redevelopment to improve the impact for those coming to the area via this mode.

Consideration of pedestrianisation of the high street should be considered to improve the quality of the space.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a civic hall, multi storey car park & town square created, with a one way traffic system running through the high street & around this square, alongside new retail developments with residential over, which would complement the existing High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf.

The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue.

Make the town centre more appealing to attract visitors

The Angel Centre/Sainsbury s area needs to be redeveloped

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use possibly adding a sun terrace to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.



---

**User Response: Text**

Yes, to use existing sites and to ensure that it is in keeping with the rest of the town.

Strong development management policies are required to ensure the historic character of the town and existing green spaces are conserved and enhanced and new green spaces and tree planting included in new and redevelopment. Any developments should be of high-quality design and use the opportunities for using renewable energy, especially that provided for by the river Medway.

No

Intelligently designed multi occupation blocks with parks and trees and retail spaces of the kind now being required in new London developments . Designed to improve people's sense of self worth and thus their willingness to maintain the places . If possible include communal garden spaces and small allotments .

Employment land should be protected from change of use to residential given that there is already a shortage of commercial provision

I think TMBC need to ensure this information is communicated to the residents in a timely manner to give opportunity to respond and feedback. Without small leadership groups many residents are in the dark about planning proposals and policies.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Make access to the info more user friendly in a more accessible manner.

I think TMBC need to ensure this information is communicated to the residents in a timely manner to give opportunity to respond and feedback. Without small leadership groups many residents are in the dark about

---

**User Response: Text**

planning proposals and policies.

I think TMBC need to ensure this information is communicated to the residents in a timely manner to give opportunity to respond and feedback. Without small leadership groups many residents are in the dark about planning proposals and policies.

The Angel Centre area (sainsburys etc) has so much potential due to its location and proximity to the station.

Sainsburys / Angel Centre and surrounding car parking spaces would perhaps provide an opportunity to create an attractive new centre, underground car parking a consideration to free space up, hopefully improved flood prevention will reduce the risk of this.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Need to develop a central area, town square type space which links the castle, sportsground and railway station.

Visitors need to be welcome by an aesthetically pleasing walk from the station down into town and drawn in to the town centre, encouraging them to wander, explore, stop and spend time.

There are so many lovely historic and architecturally interesting buildings and areas which go unnoticed and the river areas are sadly under used

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages,

---

**User Response: Text**

improving the sense of community and safety.

not really

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

make it easier to get around and attractive to visit. Don't punish people for visiting (parking fees rises etc). It's revenue to you but it's not attractive to come into Tonbridge I'd rather go elsewhere. Don't tear down our heritage to throw up square boxes and generally start to work with the residents to make planning work for everyone. More green spaces please!

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The Angel Centre and Sainsbury's site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new

---

**User Response: Text**

residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

No response

You need to engage major retailer interest. The return of a Post office might be a good start!!

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Angel centre and surrounding car parks seem inefficiently used and are surely prime area to consider. Maybe a second storey to one of the car parks with solar panel arrays would enable development of another car park? North High street has great character and should be preserved but some small sites seem commercially unviable and seem ideal for small site restoration.

Any development in and around the town centre should always reflect the residents requirements. They are the people who pay the council tax so that the council can SERVE them not the developers.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore.

The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for

---

**User Response: Text**

residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Consider mixed used development. There needs to be a refocus away from a residential drive without the infrastructure needed to live there.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike. This area has been allowed to deteriorate and is now an unpleasant place to shop.

Housing needs close the main town services should be strongly considered over any others.

Retain all the existing green spaces, such as River Lawn Green.

Plant at least one tree for every residential property in the town.

Bring people back to the high street. Use the racing course for more markets and festivals.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

No

---

**User Response: Text**

Planning policy should prioritise longer term thinking and our contributions to the Millenium Development Goals and focus on environmental protection, localising food and product supply by supporting locally-based providers and enabling and encouraging localised sustainable energy production which residents can access.

The most important aspect that stands out to me when we have visitors arrive by train is the state of the train station on arriving to Tonbridge. It is unattractive and unappealing to visit on first impressions, the shops along the bridge are vacant and scruffy. This area needs investment in order to attract tourist revenue.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys/Booths buildings are totally outdated and unused in part. There could be so much more made from these sites to create town pride, a sense of community and increase tourism revenue.

N/A

no

Use empty shops as housing

It should be sympathetic to the existing buildings.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Yes. Beauty/Aesthetics should guide development in and around the town centre.

Why not create a historic sense of the town, impose building requirements to reflect the historic nature of Tonbridge?

Put Tonbridge back on the map as a place to visit.

I am concerned that housing has been provided in Tonbridge at the same time as the infrastructure has diminished

---

**User Response: Text**

Addressing climate change should be at the core of development proposals. New development should be within walking or cycling distance to existing stations.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Strong management to ensure that high standards are maintained, renewable energy is used, and the development of green spaces is improved.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

We don't know the town centre well enough to comment here.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

NO

---

**User Response: Text**

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Ensure the benefits of the existing natural environment, inc river and sports ground, are retained and maximised. Do not sell-off land for short-term financial gain as it will have a long-term negative impact on the town. We currently benefit from the foresight of past Councils, do not create a negative legacy for future generations.

No. I think the topics have been covered fairly comprehensibly.

No

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving



---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

No

Make plans to revamp the Angel Centre and its surrounding units.

answered above

It's important to preserve as much as possible of the old town and the environment by the castle and the river, and to allow for open spaces.

See response to Q2

No

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys area needs to be redeveloped. A town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to existing architecture in the High Street. Remove two tier car park which is an eyesore.

The area around station needs to be smartened up/reimagined to be a more welcome entry to Tonbridge instead of the murky and unpleasant area it is.

Development of the existing built environment within Tonbridge town centre should be strongly considered in the first instance as there are empty unused commercial premises which could be converted to provide housing which is in immediate reach of the town centre facilities.

No

Ban pavement parking!

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new

---

**User Response: Text**

residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Make better use of the area around the Angel Centre

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness.

The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use perhaps with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The railway station approach is not only a traffic nightmare but also uninviting and needs some considerable facelift.

No Response

no

No response

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for

---

**User Response: Text**

residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

It is not clear what is happening to towns as their retail centres are being hollowed out by on-line shopping, something that has accelerated with covid. Mary Portas argues, and I think she is right, that we are in a period of readjustment. The retail offering has been poor and it will need to improve to survive. This needs to be borne in mind but retail friendly policies should be to the fore - free parking, etc

Needs to sensitive the local community needs, not profit driven.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore.

The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

Tonbridge is currently very congested and I dread to think how bad the air quality is along the high street. I would like to see Tonbridge high street pedestrianised as far as possible. It would make the town centre a much more pleasant place to visit, whereas at the moment I try and avoid the high street because I know I am going to be breathing car exhaust the whole time.

Please do not build out of town retail outlets they are awful

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

No (sorry!)

---

**User Response: Text**

We have no opinion on this matter

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

We recommend including specific policy in support of new tree planting, hedgerows and urban woodland creation. We recommend setting a target for tree canopy cover as part of this policy, to be pursued through the retention of important trees, appropriate replacement of trees lost through development, ageing or disease and by new planting to support green infrastructure.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

More hospitality/shopping should be encouraged along the river in town centre rather than residential.

See 28 above, but also look and learn from the innovative policies and practices that are being adopted by other forward-thinking Councils and landowners elsewhere. Also, work to a much longer (minimum 30 year) time horizon, adopt a 'can do' attitude and abandon the 'us and them' attitudes of yesteryear.

---

**User Response: Text**

No

No

Buildings should have green roofs and walls to encourage insects and improve air quality. It will also improve the mental health of the inhabitants.

We need to maintain quality green spaces and the local character and not allow high rise (greater than say five-storey) developments in the town.

Our services and schools are already maximised, we must be careful to keep upping the stress on our local community.

It should address sustainability

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys area need to be made more attractive to visitors and residents. Currently it is in dire need of development.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimaged and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a

---

**User Response: Text**

town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Beales site should be updated and reopened.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsbury's car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

Rydon does not have a view at this time.

Strong development management policies are required to ensure the historic character of the town and existing

**User Response: Text**

green spaces are conserved and enhanced and new green spaces and tree planting included in new and re development. Any developments should be of high quality design and use the opportunities for using renewable energy, especially that provided for by the river Medway.

**Strong development management policies** are required to ensure the historic character of the town and existing green spaces are conserved and enhanced and new green spaces and tree planting included in new and re development. Any developments should be of high-quality design and use the opportunities for using renewable energy, especially that provided for by the river Medway.

to somehow encourage new retail business and independent shops

Strategic options for Tonbridge are matters for Tonbridge residents.

No.

No

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

NA

**Key retail issues which the Local Plan can help to address:**

---

**User Response: Text**

- Positively support change which supports the role of the borough's retail centres and rural service centres, making them attractive places to visit.
- Provide policy flexibility to support the challenges and opportunities faced by each retail centre and the rural service locations.
- Consider how land can be allocated for retail and mixed-use development to meet identified needs.

See above.

No.

Tonbridge Civic Society has already provided suggestions as to what could be done with the Angel Centre/Sainsbury's site. In previous years the Civic Society has also made suggestions as to how to better integrate the area around the railway station with the town. Much could be done to give people a better entrance to the town – both by car and rail – than the current situation.

TMBC should also reference the area assessments it commissioned and published in 2008-9. This is a body of work providing detailed guidance for planning throughout the historic parts of the town.

TMBC should also compile a list of locally important buildings – of which the Tonbridge Civic Society already has a version – and to review the conservation areas. The council should also be more ambitious and include local conservation policies of their own rather than simply relying on national planning policy alone.

N/A

Angel centre needs to be incorporated into high street shopping.

Planning policy should define some form of end state vision to encompass housing, commercial, leisure and transport. At the moment, developments are taking place piecemeal - witness Cannon Lane.

Whilst we understand that our town centre needs to evolve, to meet changing needs, we have concerns about the adequacy of current development control/policy safeguards in protecting the local character and buildings that have local significance. This is particularly important for buildings located outside the Conversation Area, e.g. where a building is important to the local character and heritage of a particular area. For instance, the loss of the Primrose Inn, on Pembury Rd, which was identified as a 'landmark building' in the Tonbridge Character Areas Assessment. As such, we support the Tonbridge societies (Civic & Historical) previous calls for a List of Local Historical Assets (under the Localism Act, 2011). We also support the preparation of a Heritage Strategy (Para. 5.10.19, Regulation 18 L.P.; NB. see Q.39), to provide better policy protection. It is also important to ensure that new developments are sympathetic to the site context and



---

**User Response: Text**

character of their surroundings, especially in the Conservation Area and regardless of PDR. Hence, we support the Tonbridge Civic Society's previous call for the adoption of Supplementary Planning Documents to provide design guidance (e.g. for key sites along the river, historic centre). In addition, we consider that policies are needed to allow inappropriate and poorly designed developments to be refused, as these can violate the site context and harm the local character. Similarly, there should be policies adopted that allow mediocre design proposals to be refused and enable Planning Officers to stipulate more inspiring architecture (if appropriate in the setting). This is particularly important for buildings located in prominent positions, as too many undistinguishable buildings have been built in such sites and many of our High Street buildings are mediocre. It is important to resist ugly and inappropriate developments, as such buildings can "destroy the sense of place, undermine the spirit of community"<sup>4</sup>, which can cause significant social issues. Further to our comments in Q.28, we are concerned that our High Street could be hollowed-out, if further retail developments are permitted outside the town centre (e.g. Cannon Ln.) and with residential conversions under PDRs (see Q.19), which is likely to create a dormant town centre. Therefore, to address the first issue of outer centre developments, policies need to be adopted to ensure that our vibrant town centre remains the focus of retail development, utilising any existing vacant High Street units before permitting retail development away from the town centre. With regard to our comments above (incl. in Q.19, 28-29) about flat conversions, under Permitted Development Rights (PDR), we are concerned about the loss of retail units and offices in our town. For instance, our High Street Post Office/WHS store recently closed due to a residential redevelopment, but the Post Office is a vital service and helps attract local people to our High Street, rather than locals visiting a nearby town. Also, as noted above (in Q.19), these types of developments have a disproportionate impact on our local infrastructure and facilities/services. As many properties within Class E can change to residential use, without planning scrutiny or any consideration of the impact on established retail areas and local infrastructure, we therefore believe that the Council needs to take back control over these types of developments. One way of doing this is using the provisions under Article 4 of the General Permitted Development Order, i.e. requiring such developments to obtain planning permission. For instance, Article 4 Directions could be used by TMBC to withdraw office to residential permitted development, for the town centre area. This would help prevent the likely significant loss in office/retail floor-space and employment opportunities, together with reducing the detriment to the vitality and viability of our town centre. This would also help address some of the other issues associated with office to residential conversions under PDR. A report<sup>4</sup> notes the expansion of PDR has been criticised for "reducing quality, delivering lower levels of affordable housing and the lack of developer contributions".

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety.

The Angel Centre and Sainsburys site needs to be completely rethought and a town square created alongside new residential developments which work better with regard to the existing architecture in the High Street and around

---

**User Response: Text**

Whitefriars Wharf to retain some local distinctiveness and remove the two tier car park in Vale Road which is an eyesore. The gateway to Tonbridge from the Railway Station needs to be reimagined and the parade of shops on Railway Approach brought back into use with a sun terrace added to the rear to transform the retail space there. Having immediate aesthetic appeal on leaving Tonbridge Station, at all 3 entrances, would enhance the town's appeal to visitors, increasing tourist revenue. It would also improve pride in the town for residents of all ages, improving the sense of community and safety

No

Planning policy should define some form of end state vision to encompass housing, commercial, leisure and transport. At the moment, developments are taking place piecemeal - witness Cannon Lane.

No

No.

Stop telling everyone its brownfield development that should be the only way. Yes, brownfield first, but this will not solve all of the development needs. Many brownfield sites are not deliverable because of existing use i.e. importance and employment provision. Existing use value. The cost of redevelopment i.e. cleaning up the site of contamination. So many times the blame seems to be targeted on the developers saying the developer says it not viable but it's the regulations on contamination, the level of burden onto a scheme through S106 etc that makes a scheme not viable. The developer doesn't control these, TMBC and government do.

N/A

Redesign the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park. It should be a TOP priority in order to develop the town & make it more dynamic & attractive to residents & visitors alike.

No

N/A

N/A

---

**User Response: Text**

N/A

Why has Beales remained empty for so long and what is to become of that premises? Also, a building on the corner of Church Lane has been boarded for years, why?

no

N/A

Planning policy should define some form of end state vision to encompass housing, commercial, leisure and transport. At the moment, developments are taking place piecemeal - witness Cannon Lane.

More use should be made of the land around the Angel centre & Sainsburys. The huge surface car parks should be replaced with multi-storey parking & the land used for shops & entertainment areas.

No

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:14:04. Total records: 384

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 34] If yes, do any potential sites meet all of the crite...

User Response: Text
I'm not sure
Green spaces whether they are green belt or not should be protected
Sites adjacent to public footpaths
all ancient Woodland must be protected. All ANOB. All Green Belt. All SSSI. All wildlife sites
the area East of the town along the Medway Valley, Postern lane to Hartlake Bridge and beyond .....with breeding Barn Owls, Turtle Doves, Nightingales and many other species
There is no other space to put this which is unhelpful, but the Council must carry out up to date landscape character assessments to identify which countryside has the most value. Buffer zones around the AONB must be designated to protect its setting, something that has traditionally not been given the importance it deserves. Identifying countryside of high landscape value is also an important tool in understanding where growth should and should not be accommodated and it is unsound to consider all areas of non-AONB countryside as having the same landscape value when this is not the case.
Yes, 59819, 59817, 59832
These are all variations on the same site in Burham, between the local school and Church Street, and subject to a current open outline application by Trenport.
Have a look at the comments on the application (168) with only a single local supporter, who when you read their comment actually meant to make an objection.
The site is beautiful, open farmland and forms and important part of the vista of the AONB and the character of the village. As well as being an important wildlife habitat.
Stonecastle Quarry
Postern Quarry
Medway Valley
If you build more flats you need local green space
no idea from such a set of complex documents
The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at

---

**User Response: Text**

59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the sites 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field and should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

That is not for me to determine. However, any proposed development on viable good quality agriculture land such as Broadwater Farm, in my opinion should not be permitted.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

What is. NPPF?

Don't know, but I feel we want to preserve as much local green space as possible because it is a commodity that cannot be replaced.

Some of us have applied for village green status for the last remaining stretch of open space East of Hermitage Lane, South of the railway line and adjacent to urban development in Maidstone. As far as I know, it fulfills all the criteria. It is designated VGA 687 Bunyards Farm. A developer is desperate to get its hands on it, applying for planning permission after the village green application had been started

Land to North of Tolsey Mead, used for horse grazing. Carries a popular footpath for dog walkers. Adjoins ancient woodland and Joco Pit. Documented biodiversity. Sits on an aquifer used for water extraction. Preserve it!

Note that all of the proposed sites on Kings Hill DO NOT meet the criteria

Potential sites in West Malling are Banky Meadows, Churchfields ( by Scared Crow), Cricket Ground, Ewell Avenue, Macey's Meadow, Manor Park, Norman Road playing fields, St. Leonard's Tower, St. Leonard's Street/ Teston Road, Woodland Close/Alma Road, Green occupied by Hope statue.

59819, 59817, 59832 (in Burham). The site is beautiful, open farmland and forms an important part of the vista of the AONB and the character of the village. As well as being an important wildlife habitat.

---

**User Response: Text**

By creating protected areas you are stopping development

No sites local to Hadlow parish.

PEters pit is already built on unfortunately. Starkeys castle should be included if within border. Wouldham rec should also be kept as a green space even when trenport's in perpetuity clause expires

Green Spaces should be protected

not sure

It is the duty of every citizen either as an individual or families to contribute to conserving and enhancing biodiversity, for the sake of all of us.

The council has designated the green spaces clearly in Appendix A, and it is the duty of the Council to protect these spaces, to improve the quality of life for all of us and improve the environment.

In addition, the following could be considered -

1 Every household should plant at least 1 tree in their own grounds, guided by the Council, what is the best type to plant. (Or the developer is responsible for planting 1 tree for every dwelling they create, on their development.)

2 Every development should have 25% of space available to gardens and green spaces, including wildlife

3 Farmers and Councils should allocate 10% of their holding for replanting trees.

Local plan green space is important; TM Borough is 70% rural, however not all areas Green Belt benefit the local population or local wildlife or general environment.

Not that I can see

There are hundreds of potential sites listed, it is impossible for the lay person to be able to appraise them all and comment meaningfully. I am staggered and appalled at the size of some of the potential sites that appear to use vast quantities of current agricultural land.

This is unfair question to the unqualified.

---

**User Response: Text**

Existing Local Green Space areas that still fulfill their original purpose should be provided with protection.

Local Green Space has a fundamental purpose in the development of a community. New large scale development should be delivered with local green space and play areas embedded from the outset, but this should be identified via a master plan for the site and conditioned within planning agreements/consents accordingly.

Don't know.

-

The Racecourse is an excellent example.

Keep it as it is to be enjoyed by all.

I cannot see the potential sites.

no response

I have not studied all the current sites, the principle should apply to not only these but future sites proposed in future.

«No response»

The Racecourse is an excellent example.

Unsure

Hazel Woods - West Peckham, Mereworth Forest (The Hurst) - West Peckham

Westwood Rd Green - a really useful recreational site in the centre of estate. Used locally as play area and occasionally for local events. Would destroy character of the area if built on.



---

**User Response: Text**

No

If this means protecting of green spaces within developments, then I agree

It is important that all green spaces are taken into account when considering planning consents.

«No response»

Not specifically

I would prefer to see the Local Plan centred around the environment, climate change, biodiversity, air quality, water quality, handling of sewage, preservation of Green Belt, SSSIs, RIGs, woodland, etc rather than housing!

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Not in the local sites nearby

The area to the North of Kings Hill was identified as an Area of Local Landscape Importance (P3/7) in the 1998 local plan. This includes consideration for the vista from the North Downs Way. It was identified as the Best and Most Versatile agricultural land in the 2008 LDF, and identified as an important wildlife corridor. However, it was assigned for development in the withdrawn 2018 local plan. Some of this seems to be related to the mislabelling of Kings Hill as an urban area, whereas ONS quite clearly designates it as Rural Town. In addition, previous policies designed to prevent the coalescence of villages seems to not have appropriate weight in current decisions. Therefore, it is demonstrated that Green Belt designation is required to protect its status and ensure that, as one of the few non-green-field areas of the borough, it does not get used as the dumping ground for new housing even though such housing is not justified when looking at the local area.

Green space, assigned as part of local planning, is subsequently being built on even where the development it is associated with is not complete, this shows a total disregard for planning policies and any approach to hardening

---

**User Response: Text**

the position is requested.

The area to the north of Kings Hill was identified as an area of local Landscape Importance (P3/7) in the 1998 local plan. This includes consideration for the vista from the North Downs Way. It was identified as the best and most versatile agricultural land in the 2008 LDF , and identified as an important wildlife corridor. Prevention of coalition of villages is aspired to and therefore Green Belt designation is required to protect its status and ensure that, as one of the few non-green-field areas of the borough, it does not get used as the dumping ground for new housing even though such housing is not justified when looking at the local area.

Green space, assigned as part of local planning, is subsequently being built on. Even where the development it is associated with is not complete. Thereby showing a total disregard for planning policies so a hardening of this position is urgently required.

The sites are not laid out in a suitable manner for a lay person to adequately critique their relative merits and demerits in a realistic time frame.

No

Not familiar with any specific areas that embrace these sites but the ability to embrace these to enhance further local / urban development, akin to much of what has already been successfully achieved is a key opportunity and potential solution to much of the development requirement.

Open spaces are so important to all communities and alongside improvements in air quality ought to be a priority.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59559 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59522 Bishops Oak Rid and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of hom for relaxation, exercise and healthy living.

Yes, I think it's important for people to have green space around where they live.

I want to comment on Qu36 below. I would expect that specifically designating sites for biodiversity net gain would not be used to offset sites causing a net loss elsewhere.

---

**User Response: Text**

don't feel it is enough emphasis as green space cleans the air and this is important for the environment.

dont understand NPPF, green space should be designated for enjoyment, not for development

I don't know but I notice that site 59761 includes a woodland - Kate Reed Wood.

And protected

Not sure.

n/k

this is incredibly important and TMBC could really become a driving force in these issues given the amount of green belt, AONB etc. it has - it si an asset where it could achieve and build on these key targets.

All sites would have to meet NPPF

thats one for you to answer but you should be protecting our green spaces not destroying them.

How is it possible to expect the majority of respondents to this consultation to know such detail?

Haven't had time to look into this.

All current green space, AONB and farmland should be protected from all housing development. We must not ruin our green spaces, rural areas and countryside we are so lucky to have in the area when there are lots of other small pockets of brown field sites to use for housing.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer

---

**User Response: Text**

Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the sites 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field and should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

I think Green space is key to happy living. This could be seen during the pandemic. You would no better than I, where there are unused green spaces.

Need to ensure that they do.

Protect green space

No response

Unsure.

Areas of high grade farming land must be protected for the country to develop for self sufficiency, Green belt designation must be applied to protect areas of the borough coalescing in to a large housing blob (such as Kings Hill, East Malling, West Malling etc. coalescing in to the Greater Maidstone conurbation.

We have insufficient knowledge to answer this question.

New large green field sites should be required to designate green space and ecological corridors or features, but this is impractical for small development sites or central urban sites. We need to get density up in new developments to minimise their impact on existing green spaces. Large new green field developments need to be avoided, a last resort after all other sites in settlement areas have been used. Any blanket requirement for a proportion of green space in new developments results in wasted space. Green space has to be maintained and this requires management companies and service charges from residents of new developments. This is prone to

---

**User Response: Text**

problems and hard to sustain. Usually the green space becomes a poorly maintained verge and eventually gets taken into surrounding properties. They only work on a grand scale as part of large developments such as Kings Hill. It is better to protect the real green space, the rural areas between settlements by minimising the area for new housing, than adding to that area by asking for green spaces within the developments. Sometimes it is appropriate, especially if integrated with ecological or flood alleviation measures. In other locations it may assist place making or provide a setting for a listed building, but on most sites where it is imposed the benefits are outweighed by the greater loss of surrounding Green land and the reduced provision of dwellings. Similarly, policies to require 10% bio diversity net gain are less viable in urban areas where development needs to be encouraged. In these areas, intensification and best use of the space to deliver housing, reduces pressure for housing on green field sites, so has its ecological benefit already. If real improvements are to be achieved, then KCC highways and utility companies must be persuaded to allow more urban tree planting within highways, to green and cool these areas and combat pollution.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation as should upper castlefields which is the castle outer bailey so should be preserved on heritage grounds as well as because it provides much needed green space in a very dense housing area.

The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. The land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field and should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane, 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise

Don't know detail of NPPF to make comparison.

Couldn't say.

No response

59448

59449

59450

50630

59631

59636

59673

---

**User Response: Text**

59698

59715

59726

59740

59743

59824

59391

59393

59397

59398

59469

59460

59464

59472

59668

59694

59713

59738

59772

59780

59781

59839

59852

59856

59861

---

**User Response: Text**

59867

59868

59870

59873

59433

59436

59437

59438

59457

59494

59718

59432

59441

59442

59443

59445

59447

59456

59488

59594

59602

59603

59619

59620

59621

---

**User Response: Text**

59622

59645

59658

59672

59699

59714

59716

59733

59756

59762

59807

59814

59833

59844

59854

59860

59863

59634

59655

Thats a huge volume of information to assess in order to answer this question

Sites 59797 and 59800

No response



---

**User Response: Text**

Ightham Sandpit - this is a restored quarry that has a substantial population of Great Crested Newts. It is a beautiful area with numerous lakes and wetlands and is naturally rewilding.

Sites 59844, 59441, 59442, 59443, 59445, 59432, 59456,

current field space more than ample but better use of river

59531, 59534, 59544 & 59547 should all be designated Local Green Spaces.

no comment

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition land at 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green space along with Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly Bishops Oak Road and Quincewood Gardens. Also sites detailed as Longmead Sportsground as these provide a multitude of opportunity for children, bikes, football and walking for families and individuals with a well maintained circular path for the elderly. So this should also be labelled a Local Green Space. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500 m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

**Sites 59624, 59799 and 59723**

Planned development would likely jar against the character of the small area of existing dwellings. Site 59799, in particular, appears to cover an area containing woodland, so possible habitat loss. Also, site 59799 has a watercourse running through it, so issues surrounding pollution could arise (run-off etc) and loss of trees / concrete could increase flood risk in this area.

**Sites 59654, 59664 and 59700**

All three of these sites currently contribute to the natural beauty and character of the village. Site 59700 also appears to contain wooded areas, so building here would result in loss of habitat and increase risk of flooding due to tree loss.

**Sites 59728 and 59729**

Changing from agricultural to residential usage will negatively affect the character of the village. Removal of crops / fruit trees will likely affect drainage on the hill, leading to more water run-off into the existing village of Wateringbury to an area that already prone to flooding (e.g. Where Memories Meet). I have personally seen skylarks, adders and slowworm in this area, which are all either rare or in decline. Loss of crops / fruit trees

---

**User Response: Text**

would reduce the habitat for pollinator species specifically, which are of not just local but worldwide importance.

**Site 59797**

This site would end up linking Kings Hill and Wateringbury. Wateringbury would lose its distinction as a separate village. Loss of such a sizable area of greenbelt would be devastating for pollinators and other wildlife. This site would also split Flite Wood from the other areas of woodland to the South and from the area of woodland to the West of Danns Lane. This will isolate each woodland and prevent wildlife crossing between these wooded areas, leading to loss of genetic diversity within populations. As some of this site is a golf course, there would be a reduction in the number of leisure activities for the local population – not promising for people’s mental or physical wellbeing.

**Sites 59800 and 59802**

This site would cause encroachment from the Kings Hill conurbation towards Wateringbury village. Has a body of water, so issues surrounding pollution could arise (run-off etc) and more hard ground and building could increase flood risk in this area / be vulnerable to flooding. As a significant proportion of this site is a golf course, there would be a reduction in the number of leisure activities for the local population – not ideal for people’s mental or physical wellbeing. I have personally seen skylarks, adders and slowworm in this area, which are all either rare or in decline. Loss of crops / vines would reduce the habitat for pollinator species specifically, which are of not just local but worldwide importance. Both sites would create a barrier and therefore isolate Cattering Wood and Flite Wood, as well as the woodland to the south of Flite Wood, preventing wildlife crossing between these wooded areas, leading to loss of genetic diversity within populations.

**Site 59803**

This site would start to merge the separate villages of Wateringbury and Teston, which would lead to loss of local historic identity. Concreting to build in this area would result in significant drainage issues leading to water running down the hill towards existing dwellings, businesses and the A26.

**Site 59845**

This site would create a bridge between Wateringbury and Teston, merging the separate villages of Wateringbury and Teston, which would lead to loss of local historic identity. This site would have a huge adverse effect on the landscape. Views of the Medway River valley would be lost. Being in a high flood risk zone concreting to build on this area would result in drainage issues and possible flooding of nearby dwellings.

The Swanmead/Postern Lane area to the east of Tonbridge is a well used green space. I am not qualified to assess whether it meets the criteria set out in the NPPF

All of Table 7 needs to be protected and no houses should be built on green belt areas.

Yes, in order to achieve a coherent and connected green spaces to encourage wildlife and bio diversity.

---

**User Response: Text**

It is extremely disappointing that specific green space areas designed into kings hill have now been identified as potential locations to develop housing. This shows that even if local green space is considered in this local plan it will probably just be ignored at the publication of the next local plan when housing needs will be greater still

No response

No response

There will a risk otherwsie that the Green Space, and all of its benefits, is simply lost

All sites must be fully evaluated.

Sites in Offham which meet all the NPPF criteria:

1. Offham Recreation Ground. Teston Road ME19 5PE
2. The Village Green Teston Road ME19 5NN
3. The Cosgrave Field, Church Road ME19 5NY (including land leased by Offham Cricket Club and Offham Tennis Club)

The infrastructure provision should include amenities & assets, in the form of Countryside/Grade 1 Agricultural Land/Green Spaces/corridors (not sports fields mentioned in the NPPF list of infrastructure) between Villages so that these conurbations keep their character & uniqueness as individual villages, this will ensure the ongoing health, wellbeing & mental health of borough residents & voters.

Further, **National Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)** should be preserved such as that at Wateringbury, both physically & from the peripheral impacts associated with development.

In addition refer to the Government publication "Rural Challenge" regarding balanced development - " The countryside must be a vibrant place to live" with the rural communities being given the the power to their preserve villages."

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are currently playgrounds at Brindle's Field and should therefore be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and, instead, designated as Local Green Space, along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane, 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and

---

**User Response: Text**

promote healthy living.

We also believe there is a Covenant to prohibit building on 59550 and 59552 which was for 100 years with around 70 years remaining.

Green Space should be protected throughout the borough. Once lost, it will be gone forever

Green space MUST be retained not only as an amenity but as a factor in local character.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation.

The land at 59515, 59516, 59683 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane.

Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Have you considered the Medway Valley which borders the eastern edge of the borough? Of course it crosses boroughs, but Watlingbury is part of that valley and in the valley, with outstanding views of the valley from many different locations in the village. It is surprising to me that the valley is not an area of outstanding natural beauty or at least a county park. Should there not be coordinated work between adjoining authorities to investigate the Medway Valley from Tonbridge to Maidstone? Is it not just as naturally significant as the North Downs? It has a life of boats, fishing, water sports, it has rich agriculture, ancient bridges, Victorian locks and also industrial revolution age archaeology, Wartime archeology, Roman villa sites as well as birdlife in abundance. Sure this is a national asset we should protect?

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and

---

**User Response: Text**

designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Not all aspects as it will allow areas to be changed to housing or other aspects.

Best for an expert to address this.

I'm a member of the public!! Shouldn't an expert assess this?

They are a resource to be treasured once they have been developed they are lost for ever. They need to be preserved for the sanity of this generation and the next generations

Any development site should contain a certain area of green space.

Wildlife and biodiversity is important and green space is also crucial for mental health.

Local green spaces must be of the highest quality, or they will not be respected.

I am not sufficiently qualified to judge.

I Would like to support an application for Westwood Green (site 59525) to be designated in the local plan.

It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways

Carol singing, Keep fit Workout sessions, Community social events. Walking and exercising, meeting friends having a chat sitting on the benches.

People in the surrounding community who live in flats rely on this green to provide an outside area of nature ,peace and relaxation.

the trees are home to much wildlife , and the area is visited by foxes and badgers.

It is both a short distance away and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.

During any local emergency, fire, flood , the green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

---

### User Response: Text

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing
- Keep fit workout sessions
- Community social events
- Meeting and relaxing on the benches
- The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes
- It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

I can't say. But don't just think of Green Spaces as isolated, stand-alone areas. They can be, but the green initiative should apply to every zone, sector, location and building use.

Surely you should identify these areas?! I do not agree with building on green belt land - full stop.

There are far too many sites for me to go through and check against this criteria.

You need to save River Lawn in Tonbridge.

---

**User Response: Text**

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

It is up to local communities to offer up sites.

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing
- Keep fit workout sessions
- Community social events.
- Meeting and relaxing on the benches.
- The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes
- It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

TATION

4 | Page

? Singing such as carol singing

? Keep fit workout sessions

? Community social events.

? Meeting and relaxing on the benches.

? The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill

---

**User Response: Text**

health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature,  
peace and relaxation.

? The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited  
by foxes

? It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and  
Snoll Hatch Character Areas.

? During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used  
as a safe meeting point for residents.

I do think that we can find sites within the borough do develop that will not require us to deplete our Greenbelt  
land and diminish the AONB

Land around Mereworth would meet the criteria set out in NPPF. It is recreational in aspect, historic in  
importance including historic building in situ, and meets the other criteria. In addition much of the land is also  
'good' agricultural.

AONB, Ancient Woodland, Green Space, Special Habitats, species and Biodiversity Net Gain and Agricultural  
land should never be build on.

River Lawn in Tonbridge

Tonbridge Farm Sportsground

Land around Mereworth.

59525.

No they require more green spaces.

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site  
59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green



---

**User Response: Text**

to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

Singing such as carol singing ? Keep fit workout sessions ? Community social events. ? Meeting and relaxing on the benches. ? The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation. ? The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes ? It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas. ? During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

I'm sorry but I am not an expert on the NPPF, this sounds like a strange question to be asking the general public.....

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

There are many sites in the borough which meet these criteria. One example is The Green in Shipbourne.

Unable to comment - my expertise is not in this area. I believe that you must (as far as you are able to) protect what we have left in this area. We have some amazing places and it would be a shame to lose them.

Sorry on Qs 35 & 36 I don't feel I know enough to answer.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

---

**User Response: Text**

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation.

The land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field so should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space.

The land 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Upper Haysden Lane should be built on to remove the need to build on the green belt opposite as the road contains Tonbridge within this boundary.

Offham Parish Council supports the creation of designated Green Spaces and offers the following sites all of which which meet all the NPPF criteria:

1. Offham Recreation Ground, Teston Road ME19 5PE
2. Offham Village Green, Teston Road ME19 5NN
3. The Cosgrave Field, Church Road ME19 5NY (including land leased by Offham Cricket Club and Offham Tennis Club)

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59571 & 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Upper Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for

---

**User Response: Text**

relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Does this mean green space being in the local plan will protect it from building and changes to the environment?

Yes the Ightham sandpit is an are of significant population of crested newts and is naturally rewinding.

I don't know for sure, but the land covered by sites 59637, 59638, 59686 and 59776 are in close proximity to the community (Hadlow) and local in character and I would say they are of particular significance, at least for their tranquility and recreational value given the use made of the public footpaths through them by locals.

**Sites 59624, 59799 and 59723**

Planned development would likely jar against the character of the small area of existing dwellings. Site 59799, in particular, appears to cover an area containing woodland, so possible habitat loss. Also, site 59799 has a watercourse running through it, so issues surrounding pollution could arise (run-off etc) and loss of trees / concrete could increase flood risk in this area.

**Sites 59654, 59664 and 59700**

All three of these sites currently contribute to the natural beauty and character of the village. Site 59700 also appears to contain wooded areas, so building here would result in loss of habitat and increase risk of flooding due to tree loss.

**Sites 59728 and 59729**

Changing from agricultural to residential usage will negatively affect the character of the village. Removal of crops / fruit trees will likely affect drainage on the hill, reading to more water run-off into the existing village of Wateringbury to an area that already prone to flooding (e.g. Where Memories Meet). I have personally seen skylarks, adders and slowworm in this area, which are all either rare or in decline. Loss of crops / fruit trees would reduce the habitat for pollinator species specifically, which are of not just local but worldwide importance.

**Site 59797**

This site would end up linking Kings Hill and Wateringbury. Wateringbury would lose its distinction as a separate village. Loss of such a sizable area of greenbelt would be devastating for pollinators and other wildlife. This site would also split Flite Wood from the other areas of woodland to the South and from the area of woodland to the West of Danns Lane. This will isolate each woodland and prevent wildlife crossing between these wooded areas, leading to loss of genetic diversity within populations. As some of this site is a golf course, there would be a reduction in the number of leisure activities for the local population – not promising for people's mental or physical wellbeing.

**Sites 59800 and 59802**

---

**User Response: Text**

This site would cause encroachment from the Kings Hill conurbation towards Wateringbury village. Has a body of water, so issues surrounding pollution could arise (run-off etc) and more hard ground and building could increase flood risk in this area / be vulnerable to flooding. As a significant proportion of this site is a golf course, there would be a reduction in the number of leisure activities for the local population – not ideal for people’s mental or physical wellbeing. I have personally seen skylarks, adders and slowworm in this area, which are all either rare or in decline. Loss of crops / vines would reduce the habitat for pollinator species specifically, which are of not just local but worldwide importance. Both sites would create a barrier and therefore isolate Cattering Wood and Flite Wood, as well as the woodland to the south of Flite Wood, preventing wildlife crossing between these wooded areas, leading to loss of genetic diversity within populations.

**Site 59803**

This site would start to merge the separate villages of Wateringbury and Teston, which would lead to loss of local historic identity. Concreting to build in this area would result in significant drainage issues leading to water running down the hill towards existing dwellings, businesses and the A26.

**Site 59845**

This site would create a bridge between Wateringbury and Teston, merging the separate villages of Wateringbury and Teston, which would lead to loss of local historic identity. This site would have a huge adverse effect on the landscape. Views of the Medway River valley would be lost. Being in a high flood risk zone concreting to build on this area would result in drainage issues and possible flooding of nearby dwellings

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

I do not support the application building for Westwood Green (site 59525) to be developed on. It is an important green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways.

- Carol singing
- keep fit workout sessions.
- community social events
- social events meeting and relaxing on the benches
- trees house much wildlife in the area, such as bats and foxes
- its in a short distance and within in view of bullen corner and snoll hatch character areas.
- during an local emergency such as fire & flooding the green is used as a meeting point.
- the community, especially those in flats and of I’ll health are reliant on the green to provide and area of natural peace and relaxation.

Site 59613, 59876 and 59837 - Snoll Hatch and Addlestead sites should not be built on and should be protected.

---

### User Response: Text

The above sights as home to wild flowers and grass, making a natural habitat for local wildlife. The stream / ditch that runs down one side is home to nature such as newts and other endangered animals.

Additionally the land and ditch protects the houses on westbound road from flooding. Building on this site would increase a flood risk that's already an issue.

All sites listed about are unsuitable for development do to the following.

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.

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.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Green space amongst houses is essential for well being and healthy living, so 595572, 59641, 59550, 59552 should not be developed

Green space in the town centre is needed for the same reasons and for the aesthetic so River Lawn, 59515, and

---

**User Response: Text**

59516

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Absolutely.

ANy sites that fall within the Greenbelt

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 Royal West Kent Avenue/Rochester Road and 59516 Salisbury Road should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

It's healthier, happier and better for you and the environment

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

No response

---

**User Response: Text**

no response

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living

Connecting people with green spaces is vital for their health and wellbeing

DO NOT BUILD ON GREENBELT LAND. THIS SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN A PROPOSED OPTION. WHAT IS WRONG WITH THESE DEVEOPERS! AND WHAT IS WRONG WITH TBMC EVEN ENTERTAINING THE IDEA. THIS IS NOT WHAT RESIDENTS WANT FOR THE AREA.

Igtham sandpit

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

I think it's the role of TMBC to decide which and ensure these are protected

Agreed in principle. Not enough knowledge to comment.

1) East Malling Playing Fields (New Road). This is an important green space within East Malling and should be designated as a Local Green Space. This area is part of what was once part of the parkland surrounding Clare House so it has important heritage value.

It borders Mill Street where there is the long ragstone wall, such walls being a feature of East Malling, and here it marks the boundary of the former parkland. The parkland itself was set out with a variety of trees which can be seen along the boundary with New Road and across the site. Several may be 150-200 years old and new trees have been planted by the Parish Council when felling has proved necessary. West of the site is the land once forming part of Blacklands County Primary School, now Vigor Close, and which the Parish Council acquired

---

**User Response: Text**

from KCC. This largely open area is the home of Blacklands Scout Group and contributes to the green landscape area. As a whole the site provides a backdrop to the Conservation Area to the south and is part of the “village feel” which East Malling Village and Mill Street have kept.

The whole area with its tennis courts, ball park, play area and football pitches is in the middle of the built up area with “the Village” to the south and the estates built from the 1950’s onwards to the north. The site is well used by the local population and often in the Summer months families can be seen picnicking. There is also local wildlife such as woodpeckers which use the mature trees and squirrels.

In conclusion, it is felt this site is worthy of inclusion as a Local Green Space in the Local Plan.

2) Warren Woods Nature Park should be designated as a Local Green Space. This site was previously part of Heath Farm, East Malling which is now largely laid out for Sports Facilities to serve the community of Kings Hill to the south. The bulk of the remainder is now the much used Warren Woods Nature Reserve which is used as an informal recreation area by both residents of Kings Hill and of East Malling. The site is easily accessed from East Malling by public footpath MR114 and MR115 from Well Street and The Heath. Within the Nature Park connecting paths have been laid out between these two rights of way giving public access to the whole site. An application is pending with the County Council to upgrade MR114 to a restricted byway based on historical evidence. I believe some of the site is classified as ancient woodland and indeed was once part of East Malling being common land enclosed in the early 19th century. I consider the site is a valuable green space for local people and also has landscape value too plus providing a refuge for wildlife

Not sure, but they add to the feeling of well being.

I am unable to respond to this question due to a lack of knowledge however, green spaces should be designated and protected from any developments.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living. I take my sons to the playground at the Brindles Field site as the closest playground that is walkable, to lose this would be incredibly disappointing.

Residents should expect to have green space within a short walk of their homes for the well being of adults and children alike.

Haven’t had time to read it

Green space need to be maintained. None should be lost.

All building should be in brown field sites. This will cost more as sites will be smaller but is needed to protect the environment. Very small developments on old barn buildings could be allowed



---

**User Response: Text**

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field which should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Westwood Green (site 59525). This is critical to the nature of the local environment and is a space used regularly for recreation but also plays a part in village life. It is used for fairs, keep fit, community events.

unknown Acronyms make these consultations pointless

I have not investigated potential sites.

There are many sites in the borough which meet these criteria. One example is The Green in Shipbourne.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

We would suggest that this would make a lot of sense. Green Space would have a positive effect on your SA Objectives 1,2,5,6,8,9,10,11 and 12 so it really does seem sensible to include a requirement in the Local Plan.

---

**User Response: Text**

The Ightham Sandpit is a restored quarry that has a substantial population of Great Crested Newts. It is a beautiful area with numerous lakes and wetlands and is naturally rewilding.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

59521, Quincewood gardens should be designated a green space and withdrawn from the list of potential sites for consideration for development as residents should have access to a green space within 500m of their homes for children and adults to play and relax.

---

**User Response: Text**

Unsure

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Restored quarry at Ightham Sandpits which is naturally re-wilding and becoming a wonderful habitat for various wildlife.

Site 59759, Site 59758, Site 59757, Site 59755, Site 59752, Site 59750, Site 59749, Site 59760, Site 59594, Site 59740

See response to Q2

We have to maintain the green belt and agricultural land and find other areas for development

WMPC believes that the following sites meet the NPF criteria. They are all open to the public and WMPC would like to pursue their designation as Local Green Spaces:

Old County Ground Norman Road. Owned by WMPC. Site of first advertised Cricket Match in Kent in 1705. Birthplace of Kent County Cricket Club. Cricket and Football teams played here ever since.

Macey's Meadow Norman Road. Twenty-acre Community Orchard, with cherry, apple, pear and nut trees, plus wildflower meadows, insect and bird nesting boxes, and beehives. Owned by WMPC. Maintained by volunteers. Annual Applefest Festival. Used continually all year and at all times of the day by a range of local residents of all ages & abilities.

Manor Park Country Park. St Leonard's Street. Former landscaped garden of listed Douces Manor which overlooks the park. KCC owned Country Park with children's play equipment, lake, grazing and parkland, with café.

St Leonard's Tower. St Leonard's Tower. One of most complete 11th century Norman Keeps in the country. Owned by English Heritage. Small lawned curtilage for visitors.

---

**User Response: Text**

Village Green. High Street opposite Ryarsh Lane junction. Site of former Lock Up. Now site of significant trees, benches and 'Hope' statue by Sarah Cunningham.

Toll House Green. Highway green at intersection of Teston Road and St Leonards Street. Former site of toll house. Attractive entrance to town. Bus stop and village sign with bulb flower beds.

Banky Meadows. Police Station Road to London Road. Open meadow bounded by deeply incised valley of stream from foot of St Leonards Tower. Grazing land open to the public for as long as can be remembered. Very well use paths to Leybourne and Larkfield.

Scared Crow Green Churchfields. Small grassed area and verge belonging to TMBC.

Ewell Avenue green. Small grassed are on bend of Ewell Avenue. Attractive amenity for informal play for children.

Woodland Close green area at junction with Alma Road. Thought to belong to the now- liquidated developer and therefore Crown Property. Attractive setting at Close entrance.

Norman Road Playing Fields. Norman Road. Owned by WMPC. Very well used. Sport pitches, play equipment, tennis courts and Village Hall. Traditional setting for Village Carnival.

These sites should be readily identifiable by the TNBC planning department with the assistance of relevant organisations

No. You cannot create a space in a few years and expect it to replace an area of outstanding beauty that has taken thousands of years to evolve.

The land at 595151 and 59516 should be designated as Local Green Space.

The land 59559 and 59552 are playgrounds and should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space. Similarly 59522 and 5952.

Residents should expect to have seen space within 500m of their home.

Site 59531, Site 59534, Site 59547, Site 59884, Site 59544

**User Response: Text**

Ightham Sandpit - this is a restored quarry that has a substantial population of Great Crested Newts. It is a beautiful area with numerous lakes and wetlands and is naturally rewilding.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation.

The land at 59515, 59516, 59683 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane.

Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Areas should have a designated green space to walk, play, chat within reasonable distance of their home. 500m would be reasonable especially where more home working is likely to happen and adults need to take healthy breaks

The land areas 59821 & 59823 should definitely be considered as Local Green Spaces and should be withdrawn from the lists of sites for consideration for development. This sheep grazing grass area and surrounding trees are very well maintained by Fairlawne Estate and hosts Conservation of Natural Habitats and Species.

Site Area 59683 will lead to significant loss of amenity and recreational space at Tonbridge Farm Sportsground. We have come to know that there is insufficient capacity for even a Baseball Diamond, but now according to the plan hundreds of houses on this floodplain are being suggested, which is an absolutely unrealistic proposition and loss of Local Green Space. We definitely think that large housing development on Area 59683 will completely change the healthy living area of local community for walks and relaxation exercise areas.

No Response

n/a

No response

Probably

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green

---

**User Response: Text**

Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Westwood road in East peckham should be designated as it is used by the local community and the rest of the village for events and social purposes.

It is used by the local band, choirs, Salvation Army, carol singing, summer discos, keep fit and yoga sessions.

The trees provide a habitat for the local wildlife

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

As there is not a question which seeks specific context around BNG policies and delivery, please accept these comments as additional to Q35. In line with CIEEM guidance for delivery of BNG it is key that the Local Plan Policy refers to the fact that BNG schemes must align with all ten BNG Principles within the "Good Practice Principles for Development, A Practical Guide" in order to be classified as having achieved BNG.

Borough Green Recreation Ground, Potters Mede Sports Fields, Isle Quarry East, Crow Hill (Borough Green)

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

---

**User Response: Text**

Not all aspects as it will allow areas to be changed to housing or other aspects. We can see if this is accurately followed as a restriction for the whole borough to equally share housing requirements.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

no comment

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

Hazel Wood, West Peckham

The Hurst/Mereworth Woods, West Peckham

Insufficient time available to investigate this

Leybourne lakes green and country park.

It is not clear in the consultation document what specific need there is for the Local Plan to include 'Local Green Spaces.' These types of designation are often better suited to community-based planning initiatives, like Neighbourhood Development Plans.

I am using this space to comment on Q 34. I agree with 5.9.2, 5.9.1. In 5.9.7 I would reference that for plots 59752, 59802, 59797, 59800 it would cause great damage to areas outstanding natural beauty, ancient woodland and their local natural habitat. It should therefore make reference to the fact that the plan aims to reduce / avoid expected wildlife damage and in turn focus on brownfield sites before damaging green belt.

---

**User Response: Text**

<<No response>>

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space. In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living.

59515, 59516, 59550, 59552, 59572, should all be designated as local Green space.

Yes

Westwood Green (site 59525) should be designated in the local plan.

The area is regularly used by the community.

Keep Fit, social events, meetings. People living nearby use it to relax, observe nature.



---

### User Response: Text

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing
- Keep fit workout sessions
- Community social events.
- Meeting and relaxing on the benches.
- The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes
- It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site Yes/No 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing
- Keep fit workout sessions
- Community social events •
- Meeting and relaxing on the benches •
- The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes
- It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

- **Yes, designated Local Green Spaces are critical to meeting various Sustainability Assessment criteria.**
- The designation provides ongoing future protection such as that assigned to existing Village Greens and rural Conservation Areas

E Peckham parish council would like to make an application for Westwood green site 59525 to be designated in the local planners local green space. This one open space provided for the estate communities as a 1950s.

Westwood green is located directly in the centre of the local community is important green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways

singing such as Carol singing

---

## User Response: Text

keeping fit workout sessions

community social events for meeting and relaxing on the benches

the surrounding community especially those in flats and ill health are relying on the green to provide an area of nature peace and relaxation.

The trees house much wildlife in the areas regular relative buy boxes. Is both a short distance and within a view of bullen corner an snoll hacht character areas.

During any local emergency fire flood the green is often used as safety meeting point for residents.

The air ambulance has used the green form urgency landing.

WMPC supports the creation of designated Green Spaces, as vital parts of a settlement and local community. In order to be designated as a local Green Space, a site must:

- (a) Be reasonably close to the community it serves; and
- (b) Be demonstrably special to the local community, either in terms of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife.

WMPC believes that the following sites meet the NPPF criteria. They are all open to the public and WMPC would like to pursue their designation as Local Green Spaces:

- (a) Old County Ground Norman Road. Owned by WMPC. Site of first advertised Cricket Match in Kent in 1705. Birthplace of Kent County Cricket Club. Cricket and Football teams played here ever since.
- (b) Macey's Meadow Norman Road. Twenty-acre Community Orchard, with cherry, apple, pear and nut trees, plus wildflower meadows, insect and bird nesting boxes, and beehives. Owned by WMPC. Maintained by volunteers. Annual Applefest Festival.
- (c) Manor Park Country Park. St Leonard's Street. Former landscaped garden of listed Douces Manor which overlooks the park. KCC owned Country Park with children's play equipment, lake, grazing and parkland, with café.
- (d) St Leonard's Tower. St Leonard's Tower. One of most complete 11th century Norman Keeps in the country. Owned by English Heritage. Small lawned curtilage for visitors. WMPC has concerns about recent lack of public access.
- (e) Village Green. High Street opposite Ryarsh Lane junction. Site of former Lock Up. Now site of significant trees, benches and 'Hope' statue by Sarah Cunningham.
- (f) Toll House Green. Highway green at intersection of Teston Road and St Leonards Street. Former site of toll house. Attractive entrance to town. Bus stop and village sign with bulb flower beds.
- (g) Banky Meadows. Police Station Road to London Road. Open meadow bounded by deeply incised valley of stream from foot of St Leonards Tower. Grazing land open to the public for as long as can be remembered. Very well use paths to Leybourne and Larkfield.
- (h) Scared Crow Green Churchfields. Small grassed area and verge belonging to TMBC. Site of Bouncy Castle at Jubilee.
- (i) Ewell Avenue green. Small grassed are on bend of Ewell Avenue. Attractive amenity for informal play for children.
- (j) Woodland Close green area at junction with Alma Road. Thought to belong to the now liquidated developer and therefore Crown Property. Attractive setting at Close entrance.

---

**User Response: Text**

(k) Norman Road Playing Fields. Norman Road. Owned by WMPC. Very well used. Sport pitches, play equipment, tennis courts and Village Hall. Traditional setting for Village Carnival.

Local Green Space should only be designated if the Council consider it necessary. These spaces should only be designated on land promoted for this function and meet the requirements set out in NPPF paragraph 102. These spaces should not be mistaken for open space. The Land at Manor Farm is promoted through this Local Plan consultation for residential development. As part of the residential development open space will be provided. This open space differs from green space thus, the site should not include any green space designations.

Yes. The area to the North of Kings Hill was identified as an Area of Local Landscape Importance (P3/7) in the 1998 development framework. This includes consideration for the vista from the North Downs Way. It was identified as the Best and Most Versatile agricultural land in the 2008 LDF and identified as an important wildlife corridor. However, it was assigned for development in the withdrawn 2018 local plan. Some of this seems to be related to the mislabelling of Kings Hill as an urban area, whereas ONS quite clearly designates it as Rural Town. In addition, previous policies designed to prevent the coalescence of villages seems to not have appropriate weight in current decisions. Therefore, it is demonstrated that Green Belt designation is required to protect its status and ensure that, as one of the few non-green-field areas of the borough, it does not get used as the dumping ground for new housing even though such housing is not justified when looking at the local area. In addition, there is opportunity to offset loss of green belt around Tonbridge, to allow for development in that area which has the highest house price / earnings ratio in the borough, with the addition of green belt around Kings Hill, which has one of the lower house price / earnings ratio in the borough, allowing the government guidance to be more closely followed.

Yes.

The area to the North of Kings Hill was identified as an Area of Local Landscape Importance (P3/7) in the 1998 development framework. This includes consideration for the vista from the North Downs Way. It was identified as the Best and Most Versatile agricultural land in the 2008 LDF, and identified as an important wildlife corridor. However, it was assigned for development in the withdrawn 2018 local plan. Some of this seems to be related to the mislabelling of Kings Hill as an urban area, whereas ONS quite clearly designates it as Rural Town. In addition, previous policies designed to prevent the coalescence of villages seems to not have appropriate weight in current decisions. Therefore, it is demonstrated that Green Belt designation is required to protect its status and ensure that, as one of the few non-green-field areas of the borough, it does not get used as the dumping ground for new housing even though such housing is not justified when looking at the local area.

In addition, there is opportunity to offset loss of green belt around Tonbridge, to allow for development in that area which has the highest house price / earnings ratio in the borough, with the addition of green belt around Kings Hill, which has one of the lower house price / earnings ratio in the borough, allowing the government guidance to be more closely followed.

There may be a case of a Local Green Space Policy but the plan should not frame this policy such that it becomes

---

**User Response: Text**

tantamount to 'Green Belt' for the built up areas of this Borough, as this could have unforeseen negative consequences in providing for community related built development such as schools or indoor sports facilities.

Yes, most definitely Local Green Space must be considered

- **Sites 59842 and 59811 in particular are significant parts of the greenbelt/open countryside surrounding Hadlow and are highly valuable in terms of the environment and the character of the area, which should continue to be protected and cherished.**

The Ightham Sandpit is a restored quarry that has a substantial population of Great Crested Newts.

It is a beautiful area with numerous lakes and wetlands and is naturally rewilding.

(map image included here)

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (site 59525) to be designated in the local plan. It is an important green to the community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing.
- Keep fit workout sessions including yoga.
- Community social events.
- Meeting and relaxation on the benches on the green.
- The surrounding community including myself are reliant on this green as an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees are home for much wildlife such as bats and the green is regularly visited by foxes.
- The green is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch character areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, floods, the green is often used as a safe meeting point.
- Dog owners regularly use the green as a meeting social point.
- Children often learn how to ride bikes on the green as I did

- **Yes, designated Local Green Spaces are critical to meeting various Sustainability Assessment criteria.**

- The designation provides ongoing future protection such as that assigned to existing Village Greens and rural Conservation Areas

BAG considers this matter to be the responsibility of TMBC officers to determine as it requires complex cross-referencing and detailed planning knowledge.

In our submission regarding the policy related questions in the Local Plan consultation, BAG felt that TMBC officers were in the best position to be able to make the appropriate assessment for Local Green Spaces. However

---

**User Response: Text**

since we put in our submission, we have been approached by members as to whether or not the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation Area and the Conservation Area around Well Street should be put forward as Local Green Spaces. It is our understanding that the fact of holding Conservation Area status provides enduring protections for these places and so additional Local Green Space safeguarding is not required. Should our understanding be incorrect, then the Conservation Areas of New Barns and Broadwater Farm and Well Street (East Malling) are proposed for designation as Local Green Spaces.

Additionally we have been asked about the Warren Wood Nature Park and, having now had the opportunity to research the National Policy Planning Framework, believe that this meets all the criteria set out in Paragraph 102 for local Green Space as follows:

a) *In reasonably close proximity to the community it serves*

Placed between the local hamlet communities in and around Broadwater, East Malling, West Malling and Kings Hill, this site is not only close to the communities it serves but also provides footpath access from settlement to settlement, as well as being an amenity which is well used in its own right. The site can be accessed from the north by public footpaths MR114 and MR115, there is also footpath access from Amber lane and Clearheart lane. Within the Nature Park there are linking pathways so the whole site is accessible.

b) *Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significant, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and*

The value of this land to local communities is clear from its popularity with local residents and has recreational value, providing easily accessible woodland walks within easy reach of nearby settlements. Due to the name of this area it almost goes without saying that Warren Woods Nature Park is rich in wildlife, it also has a tranquil feel which leads naturally through from the nearby rural footpaths and Quiet Lanes.

c) *Local in character and is not an extensive tract of land*

The woodland is well established and is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land but a discreet area bordered by Kings Hill to its south and Broadwater to the north and west and the outskirts of East Malling to the east.

Overall BAG believes that the Warren Woods Nature Park should be designated as a local Green Space in the local Plan.

Otherwise opportunist building will take place reducing green site.

It is your job to identify sites.

**YES**

**I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:**

- **Singing such as carol singing**
- **Keep fit workout sessions**

---

User Response: Text

- **Community social events.**
- **Meeting and relaxing on the benches.**
- **The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.**
- **The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes**
- **It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.**
- **During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.**

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation, as should the Castle Fields site (site 59588).

- **Yes, designated Local Green Spaces are critical to meeting various Sustainability Assessment criteria.**
- The designation provides ongoing future protection such as that assigned to existing Village Greens and rural Conservation Areas

No response

**designated Local Green Spaces are critical to meeting various Sustainability Assessment criteria.**

- The designation provides ongoing future protection such as that assigned to existing Village Greens and rural Conservation Areas

**I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:**

- **Singing such as carol singing**
- **Keep fit workout sessions**
- **Community social events.**
- **Meeting and relaxing on the benches.**
- **The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.**
- **The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes**
- **It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.**
- **During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.**

Unable to comment with further information and analysis

---

**User Response: Text**

Yes (including recreational spaces and children playgrounds – see Q.34 below, also see Q.38).

The Brindle's Field sites (59550+52) meets the criteria, being in close proximity to our estate that provide valuable open space/recreational areas, which is the only playground within a safe walking distance, and are of compact areas. NB. Lower Haydesn Ln. has no footway to the Country Park.

**I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:**

- **Singing such as carol singing**
- **Keep fit workout sessions**
- **Community social events.**
- **Meeting and relaxing on the benches.**
- **The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.**
- **The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes**
- **It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.**
- **During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.**

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living. These areas have proven invaluable to the local residents when the Covid 19 pandemic started and the lockdowns were enforced.

The amenity space at River Lawn Road, Tonbridge should be given Local Green Space Designation. The land at 59515 and 59516 should also be designated as Local Green Space.

In addition the land 59550 and 59552 are playgrounds at Brindles Field should be withdrawn from the list of sites for consideration for development and designated as Local Green Space along with 59572 between Chaucer Gardens and Lower Haysden Lane. Similarly 59522 Bishops Oak Ride and 59521 Quincewood Gardens. Residents should expect to have a green space within 500m of their home for children and adults to use for relaxation and exercise and promote healthy living. These areas have proven invaluable to the local residents when the Covid 19 pandemic started and the lockdowns were enforced.

- **Yes, designated Local Green Spaces are critical to meeting various Sustainability Assessment criteria.**
- The designation provides ongoing future protection such as that assigned to existing Village Greens and rural

---

**User Response: Text**

Conservation Areas

Unable to comment with further information and analysis

Borough Green does not fit in to any upscale plans. It is the opposite of helping the environment

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing
- Keep fit workout sessions
- Community social events.
- Meeting and relaxing on the benches.
- The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes
- It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing
- Keep fit workout sessions
- Community social events.
- Meeting and relaxing on the benches.
- The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes
- It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

Some of the sites are on green belt, and should not be built on



---

**User Response: Text**

YES, most definitely Local Green Space must be considered

YES, most definitely Local Green Space must be considered

Yes, most definitely Local Green Space must be considered

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing
- Keep fit workout sessions
- Community social events.
- Meeting and relaxing on the benches.
- The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes
- It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:

- Singing such as carol singing
- Keep fit workout sessions
- Community social events.
- Meeting and relaxing on the benches.
- The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.
- The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes
- It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.
- During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.

no

I do not have that information.

[SITE REFS: 59448 AND 59450]

As well as objecting to these areas being built on, we suggest that in fact they should be allocated as Local Green

---

**User Response: Text**

Spaces. They are valuable, self contained community areas which serve an important function and should be preserved. The Greens are very close to the community which they serve - literally on our doorstep. The grass and trees provide a quiet and tranquil area, with much wildlife living in the trees and bushes. The heritage of the land is important being formerly part of East Malling Research Station.

Unable to comment with further information and analysis

Yes, designated Local Green Spaces are critical to meeting various Sustainability Assessment criteria and the designation of such spaces should be made in such a way to provide ongoing future protection such as that assigned to existing Village Greens and rural Conservation Areas.

**Q34 Do any of the potential Green Space sites meet all of the criteria set out in NPPF?**

BAG considers this matter to be the responsibility of TMBC officers to determine as it requires complex cross-referencing and detailed planning knowledge.

**I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:**

- **Singing such as carol singing**
- **Keep fit workout sessions**
- **Community social events.**
- **Meeting and relaxing on the benches.**
- **The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.**
- **The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes**
- **It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.**
- **During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents.**

[Q33]- Answer: Yes, in order to achieve a coherent and connected green spaces to encourage wildlife and bio diversity.

I suggest that the Wrotham Viewing Point at the top of the hill should be reopened as pedestrian only area with CCTV to deter the previous antisocial behaviour. It must then be regularly maintained by TMBC.

[image provided]

Answer: The Ightham Sandpit is a restored quarry that has a substantial population of Great Crested Newts. It is a beautiful area with numerous lakes and wetlands and is naturally rewilding.

---

**User Response: Text**

**I would like to support an application for Westwood Green (Site 59525) to be designated in the Local Plan. It is an important Green to the immediate community and is regularly used in the following ways:**

- **Singing such as carol singing**
- **Keep fit workout sessions**
- **Community social events.**
- **Meeting and relaxing on the benches.**
- **The surrounding community, especially those in flats, and of ill health, are reliant on this Green to provide an area of nature, peace and relaxation.**
- **The trees house much wildlife, and the area is regularly visited by foxes**
- **It is both a short distance and within view of Bullen Corner and Snoll Hatch Character Areas.**

**During any local emergency, fire, flood, the Green is often used as a safe meeting point for residents**

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:14:39. Total records: 279

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 38] What are your reasons for selecting these particular...

### User Response: Text

We need to build on what we discovered during lockdown good community support doesn't just happen we need to build future communities with places for people to socialise exercise and get support from within their community a real sense of pride and belonging

If developing, then do it on brownfield. And if doing that then maximise the use

However much I say I want the ideal, I don't think we have had that in TMBC e.g. 1-4 river Walk in Tonbridge

Developments that are sensitive to local ecology and priority species should also be included under item three

Good design cannot be achieved without all of these being equally important. The new local plan must establish a borough wide design code to expand and enhance on the otherwise broad wording of the NPPF which is too open to interpretation.

Your home is your safe space and you may spend an awful lot of time there. Potentially all your time (eg. the pandemic)

They need to be good for your health and mental wellbeing, and not detrimental to all those around you.

Ask yourself why you want to build these houses in the first place. If it isn't to make people's lives better then what is it for?

If all builds met these criteria the T&M would be a great place to live and work.

I think more green spaces are required to ensure people have some where clean to experience nature

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

The built environment has many criteria which must be satisfied to ensure any new development fits in with the local area. The local vernacular should be taken as an overall cue for design however, provided the above criteria are met newer designs may provide attractive, enjoyable and sustainable communities

It will be uplifting visually and good to live in.

They are all positive proposals which create a place that people will aspire to live

see earlier response regarding developments that do not

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

---

**User Response: Text**

Each of these design matters are inseparable and interdependent on each other

Beautiful spaces, buildings and greenery, enhance wellbeing and encourage community, harmony and safety.

All are important

It is increasingly important that areas retain their historic die ties. Diversity adds to the flavour of the borough

These are options where a balance must be struck between them.

Given you have separated your biodiversity concerns from your building concerns, I have chosen elements that will guarantee some concern for the local environment.

These questions lead people to a decision , I don't agree with a lot of the local plan especially any loss of our green spaces which is what makes The malling borough so beautiful

Surely the whole point of building all these houses is ultimately to make all the residents in this borough's lives better. Othwerwise, why do it?

Development should absolutely have a priority on functionality and health and safety and well-being but the historical aspects should be considered before house density should be forced to meet the national algorithm. Reasons: N.B. There will be a TMBC heritage strategy (useful for visitors and sense of place), and importance of the built environment of Grade 1 listed Hadlow Tower, the parkland environment of Oxon Hoath, the ancient woodland including Dene Park, the landscape in the south of the river Medway and the industrial history of agricultural industries and associated trade.

Almost every publicly and privately owned car park in urban Tonbridge has been included this Reg 18 process. These present a great opportunity for 'consolidation' i.e. a small number of the car parks could be redeveloped into multi-storey rather than surface car parks. By doing this, sympathetically e.g. 4-6 levels rather than 'traditional' multi-storey, the total number of parking spaces could be maintained or increased whilst significantly reducing the associated land take, releasing urban land for housing development to contribute to the target. Further, the car parks to be redeveloped could be sold to a commercial developer to reduce that burden on TMBC. There may also be scope to do this elsewhere in the Borough of course, but I have restricted my comments to Tonbridge due to familiarity.

To avoid over the top developments and focus on landscape

Historic areas that are densely populated, are already struggling with increasing pressure for more development, often to the detriment of their unique character. Any further development needsto preserve the character and

---

**User Response: Text**

settings of these areas and not become an urban sprawl.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Development should always be sympathetic and not brutally ham fisted

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Psychological well- being often expresses itself in physical well- being.

That is a characteristic which is strongly linked to environment and sense of community both past present and future.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements but are themselves worthy aspirations.

All are important to the existing communities.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

As previously mentioned, I have issues with the quality of design of many newly built residential areas. Whilst the construction quality appears fine, the original design is often poorly thought out, it makes you feel like nobody who looked at the designs inspected them closely enough, or cared enough to highlight obvious issues. I would also like to see more onus put on the developer to include meaningful local amenities such as corner shops, as well as large green spaces and integrated greenery such as trees and bushes.

---

**User Response: Text**

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

To meet the NPPF 14 objectives and TMBC local plan in response to NPPF.

I think it's really important to create developments with green space, play areas and promote health and wellbeing.

New developments need to be in keeping with the local area and be sympathetic to existing buildings such as the use of materials. They should not reflect what may be a current "fad" or "trend" from designers and architects or planners.

I have selected those 2 design matters because I think it is important to try and maintain the current attractive and rural quality of the council area, while ensuring that any developments function well.

New development should be of a high quality where future residents can enjoy a sense of pride to where they live. They should be designed with long term ambition, not short term objectives. Larger scale schemes are more likely to be accompanied by a design code that sets out a vision and ethos for how development will be delivered.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

n/a

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements. but are themselves worthy aspirations

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.



---

**User Response: Text**

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

The existing areas of green belt and AONB should be retained, and new developments should be optimised and 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.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

To preserve the character of the Vilages and Borough

enough mock victorian thanks.

how about some more modern design incl super affordable small properties with minimal running costs?

why not build them as local authority...private sector seems to have no interest in affordability.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations

---

**User Response: Text**

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Because these are most important to me as I believe any new development must reflect the character of the existing architecture and community.

Preserving strengths of the area

Attractive sustainable environmentally sound development should be at the top of the agenda at all times.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worth aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

I think they are all important to the general public enjoyment of where they live together with greenspace for meeting when the weather suites

We need to ensure developments do not ruin the character and attractiveness of the existing area. Villages who face large development (ie Eccles and Burham) would loose their villlage identify and character and be less appealing to visitors and residents. Green belt should be respected and residents keep their existing countryside for well being and aid health promotion. We should be seeking to keep existing site for biodiversity reasons and maintain our wildlifes existing habitats, rather than move them to other sites which are not their natural habitats.

---

**User Response: Text**

This is an area of Outstanding Natural beauty and contains many historic villages. Any development should be minimal and sympathetic to this.

Good high quality innovative architecture is paramount with a high proportion of green spaces.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Building quality is crucial. The human scale and intricate detailing of Victorian and Georgian properties have stood the test of time and these tend to make pleasing and desirable-looking buildings. Modern developments often fall short of this as an emphasis on good design is lost.

An unattractive and unsympathetic building will not stand the test of time, it is not surprising that many late 20th Century buildings are being pulled down (not good for embedded carbon) whilst many buildings from earlier remain popular. Architects and developers must be encouraged to design buildings that aim to last for decades (perhaps centuries) ahead.

Health wellbeing and local history are vital

Quality of life for residents

Quality of life for residents

All are of equal importance.

Potentially quite subjective set of priorities and difficult to argue that any of these should be more of a priority than others, while together they represent a vision of what the town and borough should ideally aspire to be for its residents.

Ideally we all need more accessible places that promote health, well-being and have good facilities. Developments should be architecturally visually attractive, sympathetic to local character, history and landscape settings.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy

---

**User Response: Text**

aspirations.

They're all equally important!

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

our local history is important to take into consideration as it is a strong part of Tonbridge.

function well matters more to me

Outside of the key urban areas the borough's character is rural. The borough is custodian to a significant numbers of areas of outstanding natural beauty, a diverse portfolio of buildings both public and also private - which are of historic interest both architecturally and/or in purpose and significant good quality agricultural land.

They are all important features

They are all important aspects of development.

These are the key features which will protect areas that are within historically important areas, have rich pasts, ones with historic or cultural features or ones which have landscapes worthy of protection as these should be preserved to protect a rich cultural heritage.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

All issues need specific discussion on individual merits. Clear details for each need to be compared and contrasted to other potentials to ensure the borough is choosing the best in each case whenever possible.

Within the Kent Downs AONB it is particularly important for new developments to be sympathetic to local character, history and the landscape setting. The special characteristics and qualities of the Kent Downs include the quality of the built heritage and settlement patterns. To conserve and enhance the natural and scenic beauty of the Kent Downs the design of new development is essential. New development should use available, sustainably

---

**User Response: Text**

sourced traditional as well as appropriate new materials and a design approach which fits neatly with and complements the valued traditions, forms and patterns of the past, while securing environmental efficiency and affordability and ensure that the local distinctiveness of the Kent Downs AONB is maintained.

Design in the vernacular - no 'Toy Towns'. Build 'Poundbury' type developments

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Developments must serve the purpose they are built for and be aesthetically pleasing whilst fitting well into their environment.

Buildings which are built counter to the vernacular look out of place and detract from an area.

Building quality is of the utmost importance

Developers must build buildings to last centuries

Maintaining a sense of character in housing is essential if you want to maintain a level of identity rather than homogenised estates.

New developments should not impact the immediate area - they should be in keeping with the local area, but also have good services and infrastructure that benefit the local area, but will also support the local infrastructure and amenities. It should not be built on Green belt land however.

Important to maintain mental health. Important to be sympathetic to the local area.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

I have already commented on the importance of density (small, attractive, ecologically designed) for developments as this is more compatible with sustainable living - especially since people also get into a lot of debt when acquiring and filling oversized houses.

I have already responded on the importance of housing models which support aims of well-being and public health (shared green spaces, cycling, food growing)

---

**User Response: Text**

If the design reflects a local vernacular - adapted over centuries I think that does lead to strong identity and place.

All above are equally important

The preference selected is on the basis of very strict control in terms of every aspect of a development, including size, location, and well being of the existing local community.

I support new housing that is developed in sympathy with the villages and towns it will sit within. I support proportional development. I am totally against large scale development alongside and dwarfing its neighbours, thus changing and destroying the heritage and communities that exist currently

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

It would be equally valid to select all the design matters listed but I would prioritise developments that are sympathetic to the local environment in its broadest sense as well as positive places for people to live.

If developments do not reflect local building characteristics then local identity is lost and all urban areas become bland copies of each other.

Any building should have an appeal that gives them an identity which also blends in with the local surroundings

Natural and in keeping with our best examples of architecture. Building where absolutely necessary should be high quality, visually attractive and sympathetic to local area.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

---

**User Response: Text**

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Because i felt them the most suitable.

Attractive developments are less obtrusive and well built ones can look as though they belong within the local area. Maximising profit in order to squeeze in multiple houses that are cheaper to design and build would be out of place with that local aesthetics of half timbering and tile hanging (for example).

See comments made by Hadlow Parish Council ..... especially on density and heritage strategy.

Maximise home numbers in the area. Need to fit in with the existing landscape and function well in all aspects, not adding detrimentally to pollution

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthynaspirations.

They appeal most to my own values - believe sustainability and developments being proportionate to existing settlements are important.

No response

Be more clear in the terms used.some questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Health and well being in an attractive community

They need to be identified otherwise they could easily be overlooked when the plan is finalised.

Tonbridge and Malling has many historic buildings and places which contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the borough. There are registers and policies in place to identify, designate and protect these,

---

**User Response: Text**

but they are not being recognised or enforced. The setting of listed buildings is as important as the fabric for the continued value of heritage assets and is afforded protection by the legislation and planning guidance. New greenfield development and urban spread changes irrevocably the setting and quality of isolated rural buildings and farmsteads. Existing listed buildings and Conservation Areas suffer where congested busy roads pass through them and this will only get worse if new development is approved in surrounding areas. The damage to the setting of Tudely church by the approval of surrounding development and criminally damages the value of this unique heritage asset. There are some locations close to isolated heritage assets where development must not be permitted if we are not to lose them forever. In the same way why are KCC allowed to rip out the paviers that characterise the Conservation Area in Hadlow and replace them with low maintenance Tarmac? Surrounding owners can't rip out the timber windows from their houses and replace them with low maintenance uPVC. Why does the borough have one set of rules for residents and another for outside agencies. We pay them. Why don't we get the service?

The priorities set out above are intended to ensure that new development is particular to the area, protects the local assets and sense of identity that makes the place worth living in. All the points are important and should form the minimum basis of any design, but we all know from experience that large developer schemes foist a standard product on us, dressed up with lots of justifying statements that make no difference to the relationship between the design and the site. You will only get site specific and appropriate designs if the big sites and national developers are kept out and small sites adopted, suitable for local specialists and designers who care about where they live.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

You have started to built monstrosities in Allington (what is that horrendous building?) No high rise flats in the countryside please.

All developments must be able to function well and enhance the area and MUST be sympathetic in design to local character and history and landscape otherwise they will be incongruous undesirable places to live and look at.

No response

These will keep the character of the area. Optimising density and scale will not

all important



---

**User Response: Text**

No response

Each region of the UK has its own character and we should be trying to preserve this so far as is possible while providing safe, inclusive developments

CPRE Kent considers that all the listed design matters are important - developments should be sympathetic to local character to preserve the uniqueness of our individual communities.

There should be an emphasis on optimising density, even if this is above the norm for the locality. The other design criteria should then ensure that sites are assimilated into the fabric of the area - resulting in good quality, attractive design.

Must fit in with what already exists - no tower blocks for instance

I have addressed this in a previous question. Lower density housing should be in villages otherwise the character of the village will change and not for the better.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Sustainability and well-being.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

---

**User Response: Text**

I believe any new development should not detract from the local area, and should provide a positive contribution to the area. This includes investment in infrastructure, as well as provision of public services, and business opportunities (shops etc.).

All designs matter to me as they are being proposed for green belt land and this should not be allowed to change

whatever is built people and our heritage must be considered

- use and appearance within design creates the end user experience, if it doesn't work it creates friction and unease.

This area is fortunate in having many sites that are high quality built and rural environment. It is very easy to destroy or degrade a site's quality with a new development or lack of consideration of impact of increased traffic etc.

They all seem worthy aspirations but need clearer definition within the plan.

I would like to see developments that have character that reflect Kentish architecture, that value and enhance the setting that they are in with good communal spaces. TMBC should encourage developers to not just construct houses from they stock plans, to avoid identikit estates appear all over the borough. Larger developments should be parcelled up to different developers with who then adhere to an over arching master plan. This was the Kings Hill proposition, but recently all the developments are now being done by Bellway.

Developments should have adequate parking for the amount of housing and should appreciate that the children in 3-5 bed houses will at some point become young adult drivers, who have cars on top on the two parents cars. Driveways really work for reducing the amount of street parking, yet TMBC seemed to have abandoned this approach.

no comment

Health and well being are important so quality, sympathetic and well provisioned development are vital.

The three I've selected stand out significantly more than the others. Quality of life, well-being and the environment and landscape are of utmost importance.

---

**User Response: Text**

Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements but are all worthy aspirations.

A "Sense of Place" through thoughtful design and materials borne out of the geology and natural resources of the local landscape adds enormously to the interest of the built environment and supports local materials supply e.g. deciduous forestry, wealden clay products.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

As indicated before, the priority should be to improve the quality of the Borough for the future

I want design that is sympathetic to the local area and not anonymous estates where there is no green space.

Developments should be sympathetic to local character to preserve the uniqueness of our individual communities. Good design is visually attractive.

No response

No response

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

All are equally important but have prioritised 3.

All these matters are important for preserving the character of settlements in the borough and ensuring good design.

Blending in with the local environment enhances local character in a developmental way through time.

---

**User Response: Text**

Safety, inclusivity and accessibility to promote health, wellbeing and with good facilities, are absolutely key attributes.

Avoidance of crowded, dense developments so that residents have space to live and breathe are important for wellbeing, health and contentment.

We expect T & M Council to fulfill their legal duty by Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting and any features of architectural and historic interest as well as pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas when exercising its planning functions, this will particularly be relevant to Watlington & adjacent local area.

In essence T & M Council must adopt "a strategic policy aimed at protecting the clear separation, and therefore identity, of local settlements such as Watlington, known as an anti-coalescence policy."

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

all are important but I have prioritised 3

Too many ugly developments and additions in the Borough. Development must fit the environment and where rural should enhance the character not offend.

Because these are the design matters that are most important to me!!

Heritage and Health of residents.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

We have to want to live in the borough to do that it has to work for us all and be attractive

The answers ticked are obvious.

Development sites should be diverse and include opportunities for first time buyers and professional families, as

---

**User Response: Text**

well as affordable housing. This would ensure good economic development in and around the village.

Must be a mixture of housing that provided for first time buyers and families not just affordable housing

The built environment has to cater for all aspects of the population requirements. The historic environment coupled with the benefits of keeping the local areas in an attractive, safe and efficient environment should be key targets. The local plan must support and recognise the existing Conservation areas, AONB's, Green Belt and future developments must enhance these aspects rather than ignore and erode their standing

Good quality that is in keeping with the area.

Any building needs to be sympathetic to the area.

There should be no limit of the quality of development design.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used . Some of the questions raised require subjective decisions ,while being good ideas .

To create a viable, thriving community we should strive for the very best in all aspects of development.

No response

Reasons for visiting town centres is and will continue to change. The alfresco cafe society, involving entertainment and meeting spaces will drive the future viability of the town centres. Relying on shopping is no longer viable.

we dont want to become just another standard development of houses that can be seen in any town across the country. they should be sympathetic and add value to the area - so those who move can feel welcome and part of a local community within the larger TMBC community

I have expressed throughout this questionnaire that any development should be sympathetic to the current area, communities and most importantly proportionate.

---

**User Response: Text**

Agree with the Hadlow Parish Council response to this question: Development should absolutely have a priority on functionality and health and safety and wellbeing but the historical aspects should be considered before house density should be forced to meet the national algorithm. Reasons: N.B. There will be a TMBC heritage strategy (useful for visitors and sense of place), and importance of the built environment of the Tower (why wasn't this in the blurb?), the parkland environment of Oxenhoath, the ancient woodland including Dene Park, the landscape in the south of the River Medway and the industrial history of agricultural industries and associated trade.

On a personal note The Roughway is a gem that provides a huge and untold benefit on the health and well-being of many local residents. You can't underestimate the value that such beautiful areas provide to their local communities and they should be treasured and protected not only for the joy of the local community but for the rich, diverse wildlife that adds so much to the atmosphere of this magical place. You only have to look back at Covid lockdowns to have seen how much we suddenly treasured our landscapes and depended on them..

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Houses should be practical and affordable, whilst being in keeping with local area.

need good quality new builds which are decent places to live

Developments must be in sympathy with existing environment and not exploitative. Refer previous comments.

Chapel Down considers that the allocation of site 59831 for housing will help to create a sense of place for the vineyard, which is a key aspect of design for development. This could be achieved through a variety of ways, including but not limited to a landscape led design approach to reflect the character and nature of activities at the vineyard. Full details could be discussed with TMBC to ensure this is achieved.

Developments should fit in with the established community in which they have chosen to live.

The Green Belt must be protected at all costs

---

**User Response: Text**

we cannot allow any development take away the character of the local area

Too many modern developments are poor quality with tiny living spaces that do not offer attractive long term living. In combination with this, well thought through developments that are appropriate to and rooted in the local environment create the best long term living.

The developments previously created to be physically attractive do not work and appear less attractive to the community such as making houses odd colours. Keep quality high and blend the housing into the area in a traditional manner. Housing must promote health and wellbeing and to do so is to maximise footpaths, cycle paths to keep the residents fit and healthy, this way there will not be such a demand on local amenities such as GPs, stats show that most healthy persons do not regularly go to the doctors.

Again, surely these are things are always and already taken in consideration by planning officers when considering any planning application?

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

no response

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Selected that all are equally important but as before I would strongly suggest that you put weightings against each of these as some are of great importance to some people than others and so opinions and strength of feelings are not available to you through selecting just a few items.

---

**User Response: Text**

No response

developments should no over awe or take over an existing local area and should fit appropriately.

dwellings should be sized for the housing needs of people looking for homes in the borough.

They should prevent urban sprawl and coalescing of separate areas.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Well designed high density housing and improved shopping, entertainment & parking facilities in the town centre, not outside of it, will ease pressure on the green spaces which are but a short walk away eg the sportsground & the towpath

Sense of place, identity and community is a dying thing, needs to be promoted.

Blending in with the local environment enhances local character in. developmental way through time.

Safety, inclusivity and accessibility to promote health, wellbeing and with good facilities, are absolutely key attributes.

Avoidance of crowded, dense developments so residents have the space to live and breathe is important for wellbeing, health and contentment.

Environmental sustainability is key for any development utilising practical and economically viable measures to save energy, reduce heat loss and reduce water consumption.

I am considering the sustainability of the development as well as the impact on place and people in the short term. Any plan must have in mind the health and well-being of those who live there - otherwise what is the point?

Development should always be sympathetic to local character and community. Good design engenders a sense of pride in that particular area which is rewarded by locals looking after the area.

All matters are important and a function of good design.



---

**User Response: Text**

Development in the borough should not ruin the local character of places such as Hadlow and its environs. Larger developments of more than around 15 to 20 homes would have a highly detrimental impact.

These are the nearest to what should be the key objective of building housing which will not degenerate into neglected rough areas because it is well built and pleasing to inhabitants in ways which encourage responsible use and maintenance over the long term . There are many beautiful medieval churches and villages in TMBC , which have lasted 700 years or more eg Cobham , Stansted , parts of Wrotham . TMBC should not be allowing the construction of cheap housing which is likely to last a few decades and become uninhabitable or degenerated in the short or medium term .

Development should be regarded as a long term installation and therefore needs to be well planned for current and future generations that will stand the test of time and compliment their surroundings

The three I've selected stand out significantly more than the others. Quality of life, well-being and the environment and landscape are of utmost importance to me

It is important developments serve the people who reside in T&M and are practical however there is a strong heritage in the area and sense of identity that should be retained.

Considering the scale of developments in relation to existing character in an area will help new buildings to be successfully integrated into existing or upgraded systems.

T&M is quite monocultural and designing a more inclusive environment would be much more inclusive of many social groups.

They all matter!

design of developments should be holistic - this is critical to a successful development

A redesign of the area around the Angel Centre and Sainsburys car park is a top priority in order to develop the town to make it more dynamic and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective

---

**User Response: Text**

judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Preservation of character.

As I have indicated elsewhere in this questionnaire any development in this area should be sympathetic to the area retaining its character and ruralness. It is a rural area and should remain so without destruction.

All are important in the correct location.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Maintaining the identity and character of Hildenborough is key to selecting the design matters above.

Preservation of character.

Sport England would encourage the Council to incorporate a policy for Active Design in its new local plan. Sport England in conjunction with Public Health England produced 'Active Design', in October 2015. It is a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. The guide sets out 10 key principles for ensuring that new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity including informal activity in their day to day lives through the incorporation of good design. The guidance is currently being updated but the current guidance with case studies can be viewed at [www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design](http://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design)

get housing but protect the countryside. Make housing affordable. Bring young to Tonbridge

New developments in or close to Conservation Areas should be avoided

---

**User Response: Text**

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

It's what I believe is required

Kent is full of charming villages and vernacular architecture and therefore it would be so damaging to develop identi-kit housing estates.

They are all important and not mutually exclusive.

Health and well being has added benefits, developments with character and quality add to the attractiveness of the area.

I do not want any of the Green Belt to be taken away for the development of houses, businesses or public amenities., nor any of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to be encroached on.

I do not want any farming land to be used for housing because we will need to grow more of our own produce in the coming years, and these farm lands often abut the Green Belt and AONB.

Having chosen to live in a rural village setting, the building of inappropriate housing that does not fit into the character of the area is to destroy the very nature of our Kent villages which reflect the need of quiet , the need of fresh air, the need of exercise, the sight of the night sky and of bats , and the sound of owls calling. Extra lighting from more houses in Ightham and Ivy Hatch All these things define the word 'rural'

All reflect my feelings as to how development should be carried out. See my Q18 response.

Each of the design matters are intrinsically linked to achieving the aims and objectives of the NPPF and must be delivered together.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

We regard them all as equally important.

It is important that developments are fit for purpose, visually attractive and blend into the local area. They should

---

**User Response: Text**

be suitable for families and a safe environment for children

I believe these three are more important than:

a) visually attractive - not a priority

b) developments that are sympathetic to local character - aka only the traditional mock tudor will be accepted. No

c) developments that establish a strong sense of place - what does this mean?

All above important with sensible and sensitive design

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Developments should reflect the local character of our unique villages

I think where developments are permitted they must fit in with the local environment and where possible enhance it.

All our important. Safe, inclusive environments need to be created but in sympathy with the local surroundings and character and history. Any development needs to be of exceptional quality with high performance with minimal environmental impact. Net zero.

West Malling village is a very historical village with lots of character. It is important that any housing developments are not eye sores on the landscape. We need to retain the character of the village.

Heritage, well-being, health of residents and a sense of belonging.

See response to Q2

They are all important, we need good high quality housing that has adequate facilities to address the population

---

**User Response: Text**

as opposed to just the additional dwellings.

All developments should be functional, suit the area and provide good facilities for all users

Sustainable development should also be prioritised. Not building on flood risk areas or areas that will increase water pressure / flood risks (Pikey Lane / Broadwater Farm) and including of solar / green energy for all new builds should be required. How can we build so many houses in an area that has an ideal climate for solar and not make it a requirement?

The overall quality of the area is provided by its essentially rural character and I estimate these points are most likely to protect it.

The plan will result in overcrowding of the smaller villages.

1. Development allocated within the plan will become the long terms homes for the future occupants and so delivering sites that function well, are inclusive and accessible is extremely important.
1. Similarly, new development cannot be viewed in isolation and so must be sympathetic to local character, history and landscape settings if it is to be accepted by existing residents of the towns and villages where it is proposed.

A lot of the plans areas look to be large extensions to areas without consideration to the impacts this will bring to social and environment issues that are already strained.

The maintenance of the identity of Hildenborough Village including Hilden Park as a separate rural entity should be key when selecting the design matters referred to.

Developments should be sympathetic to local character to preserve the uniqueness of our individual communities. Good design is visually attractive.

No Response

We are all going to have to live with these developments for many many years. They need to be easy to live with on all levels

---

**User Response: Text**

These can all be met but a high level of design scrutiny is needed

Successful design encompasses many factors and should include all matters set out in question 37. However, certain principles are able to achieve multiple objectives. Well planned, sympathetically designed places which meet the needs of their residents offer the best prospects for creating successful communities.

This is an area of significant beauty and history which should be retained rather than ruined by insensitive over development.

No response

Community matters.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

To keep the current character of the local area

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

I'm afraid I will not be able to complete the rest of this Questionnaire as time has run out on me. Sorry, but I didn't know of the existence of the TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18 Consultation until two days ago and I have not had time to consider any more of the questions and answers.

We have not seen this considered for current plans that this being considered.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

---

**User Response: Text**

We need to protect our heritage and character of the area

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

no comment

No Response

This is an area of beauty, people have purchased property here and desire such properties with this a main attraction. Being in keeping with the local character, history and landscape is essential for maintaining this area and it's heritage. Anything less is sacrilege and a thorough disappointment. Reference- Borough Green Garden City 59830 & Ismays Road 59608.

Each of the design matters are intrinsically linked to achieving the aims and objectives of the NPPF and must be delivered together.

I am a property professional and know this to be the case

We are so lucky to live in an attractive and green part of the world. We must do everything we can to protect the history of these landscapes, the biodiversity and the uniqueness of this borough. I feel blessed to live here. I was brought up in Hounslow in Greater London where the only nearby truly beautiful open spaces were National Trust, English Heritage and Royal Parks. Human beings need open spaces and nature to thrive. Let's preserve everything that's great about our c.70% of the Borough that is Green Belt.

Health, well being & happiness of all residents.

Response to Q. 35:

The Environment Act 2021 sets a clear direction of travel for developers to leave biodiversity relating to development in a better state than before and ensure at least a 10% net gain. Berkeley was the first major developer to commit to delivering a net biodiversity gain on all its projects in 2017.

However, any net gain in excess of 10% should be subject to a viability assessment (including in relation to

---

**User Response: Text**

possible site allocations) and should not be considered a requirement to make the development acceptable in planning terms (i.e., any provision in excess of the 10% figure should be considered an additional benefit of a proposed scheme).

PPG Paragraph 022 (Reference ID: 8-022-20190721) advises that biodiversity net gain can be achieved on-site, off-site or through a combination of both on-site and off-site measures. National guidance does not explicitly state the percentage split between such provision, but Paragraph 023 (Reference ID: 8-023-20190721) confirms that such gains can be delivered entirely on-site or by using off-site gains where necessary.

Berkeley would expect the policies and allocations of the Local Plan 2040 to reflect the ambitions of the Environmental Act and national policy and guidance - incorporating the necessary level of flexibility in any allocation requirement and/or policy, providing opportunities to create networks to not just support biodiversity enhancement on-site; but also, to encourage residents to have access to the natural environment on other sites (off-site) across the Borough. This would ensure improvements are both beneficial and viable.

Response to Q. 36:

Berkeley considers this to be a good idea that the Council should continue to investigate. As is explained in our response to question 35, off site provision is supported through PPG and if developers know in advance where net gains can be made, then delivery of more challenging sites can be achieved in a timely fashion, and be supported by the Council.

Development should have a priority on functionality and health and safety and wellbeing but the historical aspects should be considered over house density that is forced to meet the national algorithm. Reasons: N.B. There will be a TMBC heritage strategy (useful for visitors and sense of place), and importance of the built environment of the Tower (why wasn't this in the blurb?), the parkland environment of Oxenhoath, the ancient woodland including Dene Park, the landscape in the south of the River Medway and the industrial history of agricultural industries and associated trade.

Carbon neutral hasn't been included. We must focus on building for the environment in the long term, not polluting and damaging our land.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.



---

**User Response: Text**

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

Because all are equally important

No comment

Rydon does not have a view at this time.

All these matters are important and a function of 'good design'.

All these matters are important and a function of 'good design'.

- The design matters listed are all important
- It should be the responsibility of professional planning staff to ensure developers' understand and adhere to such matters during preplanning processes
- There must be proper enforcement of such design factors when developments are actually built
- Designs should be sympathetic to the existing area with a view on how these properties will enhance, not diminish, the character of the area.

- Any developed within East Peckham must be understanding of the lack of a GP service at surgery and flooding problems we face.
- Development should blend in, be safe and improve quality of life this should be put above optimising density.
- For example in East Peckham it will be very difficult to place a development that does not create increase flood risk. Endangering existing property and residents increase risk of isolation increased workload and pressure upon voluntary services such as blood borders would must be avoided.
- No development within E Peckham can be focused on optimising density.

WMPC prioritises the above design elements because of its focus on maintaining the heritage aspects of our town, making West Malling a sustainable community that is fit for the future and working with developers and others to create a safe, desirable place to live and work.

---

**User Response: Text**

All design matters are important but their relevance and priority will change on a site by site basis. The above have been selected specifically having regard to site 59764 and its ability to deliver an attractive new development that creates a sense of place for its community whilst optimising the land available to deliver much needed new homes.

Quality of life for residents is essential. Development should create safe, inclusive and accessible places to promote health and well-being.

Quality of life for residents is essential. Development should create safe, inclusive and accessible places to promote health and well-being.

Whilst not wishing to comment in detail on this point, we nonetheless believe that all the design issues highlighted in section 5.10.15 are important when considering the issue of design, and can confirm they would form part of Redrow's design considerations when looking to develop a site. To this end the attached document look to demonstrate how the initial development proposals for the land east of Carpenters Lane/ north of The Paddock, Hadlow could accommodate these design matters.

As set out above Redrow's initial development proposals as set out in the attached document look to demonstrate how the land east of Carpenters Lane/ north of The Paddock, Hadlow could accommodate a scheme that is visually attractive, and sympathetic to the local character, history, and landscape setting of the area, whilst also establishing a strong sense of place and identity. It would also look's to optimise the use of the site whilst having regard to the site constraints, and create a safe, inclusive, and accessible place that promotes health, well-being, and access to local facilities. As a result it will function well and add to the overall quality of the area for the lifetime of the development.

Each of the design matters are intrinsically linked to achieving the aims and objectives of the NPPF and must be delivered together

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective

---

**User Response: Text**

judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

You must preserve the identity of the Hildenborough and Tonbridge as much as possible, also which is most important its historical context.

Developments should be sympathetic to local character to preserve the uniqueness of our individual communities. Good design is visually attractive.

The design matters listed are all important and it should be the responsibility of professional planning staff to ensure developers understand and adhere to such matters during preplanning processes and that there is proper enforcement of such design factors when developments are actually built.

Design of development for everybody's well being is important. At the moment it feels like houses will be built no matter what.

Developments must serve the needs of the community. Developments are not for satisfying the egos of extremists who do not appreciate economic and 'real life' matters.

- The design matters listed are all important
- It should be the responsibility of professional planning staff to ensure developers' understand and adhere to such matters during preplanning processes
- There must be proper enforcement of such design factors when developments are actually built
- Designs should be sympathetic to the existing area with a view on how these properties will enhance, not diminish, the character of the area.

N/A

Not to be over crowded, with wide roads and houses set back from pavements, off road parking and sense of space.

- The design matters listed are all important

---

### User Response: Text

- It should be the responsibility of professional planning staff to ensure developers' understand and adhere to such matters during pre-planning processes
- There must be proper enforcement of such design factors when developments are actually built
- Designs should be sympathetic to the existing area with a view on how these properties will enhance, not diminish, the character of the area.

Different areas have different characters history and settings as well as different senses of place and identity. Follows, therefore, developments must be all inclusive of these factors.

We have briefly outlined some of our main reasons, as follows:

? Development that adds to overall quality of the area – we believe that design proposals should both respect the local character/setting and where appropriate provide inspiring architecture. Mediocre designs, for prominent positions in our town, should be refused. As noted above (in Q.29), it is important to resist ugly and inappropriate developments, as such buildings<sup>4</sup> can destroy the sense of place and undermine the spirit of community.

? Developments that are sympathetic to the local character/landscape setting – as discussed above (in Q.19), the design of developments within the setting of an AONB is paramount to minimise the visual impact. For instance site specific policies should be adopted that set height and scale limitations of proposed developments. Also, as noted above (in Q.19), inappropriate development proposals (e.g. tower blocks) often do not respect the local character and/or context of their siting, which can create a loss of the sense of place. As such, we advocate that robust policies are adopted, to resist inappropriate development. The policies we advocated would support sustainable development and Objective No. 6.

? Developments that promotes health, wellbeing and have good facilities – we believe that design proposals cannot be considered sustainable development without ensuring adequate local community facilities. We believe that the provision of adequate local community facilities are fundamental the achieving the social objectives (i.e. NPPF Para. 8 and Objective 1 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal). Also, in view of shortly being new parents, we strongly believe that it is vital that every community has access to recreational spaces (incl. children play areas, see Q.32), within a safe walking distance (i.e. <500m).

- The design matters listed are all important
- It should be the responsibility of professional planning staff to ensure developers' understand and adhere to such matters during pre-planning processes
- There must be proper enforcement of such design factors when developments are actually built
- Designs should be sympathetic to the existing area with a view on how these properties will enhance, not diminish, the character of the area.

---

**User Response: Text**

Different areas have different characters history and settings as well as different senses of place and identity. Follows, therefore, developments must be all inclusive of these factors.

Because all are equally important

There should be clearer definitions of the terms being used. Several of the questions are asking for subjective judgements, but are themselves worthy aspirations.

All are important.

Because all are equally important

The first stage has concluded that there are exceptional circumstances at strategic level which justify the alteration of the **GREEN BELT** boundaries

**THIS IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE.** There can never be any circumstances which should allow housing on a **GREEN BELT** site.

Properties need to look attractive, well spaced and with gardens to include car parking.

All except "Developments that create safe, inclusive and accessible places that promote health, well-being and have good facilities".

I have excluded the one I have because this sounds like a code for Borough Green Garden City.

Different areas have different characters history and settings as well as different senses of place and identity. Follows, therefore, developments must be all inclusive of these factors.

The design matters listed are all important and it should be the responsibility of professional planning staff to ensure developers understand and adhere to such matters during preplanning processes and that there is proper enforcement of such design factors when developments are actually built.

Answer: - As indicated above.

---

**User Response: Text**

To keep local and rural areas safe from over development

Answer: Developments should be sympathetic to local character to preserve the uniqueness of our individual communities. Good design is visually attractive.

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:15:06. Total records: 334

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 43] What are your reasons for selecting this policy opti...

### User Response: Text

As I have stated I do not live in the Medway Gap local identity is essential for community cohesiveness unique identities need to be respected

I think this provides a balance between protecting rural communities and enabling new housing

Existing villages and communities would lose their individual character and identities. The Green Belt was introduced to prevent this type of urban sprawl.

Don't develop on green spaces

More greenfield will be needed by 2040.

There are no existing exceptional circumstances to justify adding further land into the Green Belt in this area. It is understood that doubts were expressed about this policy approach in the examination of the previous TMBC Local Plan. Our view is that whilst exceptional circumstances exist to support the release of Green Belt land, they do not exist to support an extension to the Green Belt. A general countryside policy would provide sufficient policy protections against unplanned development.

Land beyond the Green Belt is under immense development pressure and the Green Belt should be expanded here to maintain the separate identify of settlements.

I'll be honest and say I'm not sure I understood option 2, but one way or another I think you need to take some green belt land to use for your objectives in order to protect the rural communities as a whole.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

To stop this continual no hold barred building

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I do not support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the4 general line of Wateringbury Road, East Malling between the built up areas of West Malling and East Malling.

This would:

Prevent the merging of the local villages and Kings Hill

Protect the open rural landscape, and

Safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street

---

**User Response: Text**

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

Would like to have put Option 3 but realise that housing needs may require some use of green belt but I hop this would be minimised.

I fully support the extension of green belt boundary covering the area highlighted ....key potential coverage. This appears to cover the area from West Malling out to the line of Wateringbury road and includes East Malling village.

It will prevent the merging of historic local villages and the conurbation of Kings Hill. Protect and safeguard the areas natural rural setting and diverse landscape and wildlife with many footpaths bridal ways and quite lanes. It will ensure no further erosion of quality agricultural land and protect the environment and the conservation areas including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

This area needs to be protected for future generations to enjoy and remain one of the jewels in our Boroughs crown

Green Belt is sacrosanct and meets many conservation and biodiversity needs

At saturation point, consideration should be given to conservative inroads into the green belt. However I do not agree that green belt should be used to join Kings Hill to surrounding local villages. That is simply linking already densely populated areas together to make one big, overly dense development.

extending this boundary will lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

If it is not possible to extend the green belt boundary in the north east of the TMBC area, it is vital that development is not allowed between the distinct locales of East Malling, Kings Hill, West Malling, Leybourne and Larkfield. The Local Plan must be capable of preventing this urban sprawl.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

There should be more green belt



---

**User Response: Text**

They are in limited use and, to a degree, appear to work. But, they should NOT be used to run already long established communities into each other, viz. the Garden City plan.

To provide a greater area of green belt that will enhance the local area

will keep repeating myself that the countryside should remain green and not urbanised

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Make better use of PDL.

To protect more greenfield area's for the future.

Protect some of the green areas along the River Medway on the East bank

There are no existing exceptional circumstances to justify adding further land into the Green Belt in this area. It is understood that doubts were expressed about this policy approach in the examination of the previous TMBC Local Plan. Our view is that whilst exceptional circumstances exist to support the release of Green Belt land, they do not exist to support an extension to the Green Belt. A general countryside policy would afford provide sufficient policy protections against unplanned development.

I would like to see the concept of the greenbelt modernized for the 21st century and less Londoncentric. It was developed when London was at risk of sprawl. Now many villages are at similar risk. I would propose that mini greenbelts are created to protect the character and environmental quality villages and towns. I would create new villages to cater for the demand rather than simply expanding existing towns and villages.

To avoid coalescence between West Malling, Leybourne, East Malling and Kings Hill which would result adversely in the mental health, air quality, amount of agricultural land, traffic congestion, etc for residents.

If extending the Green Belt is necessary to justify building and especially buiilding on Brownfield sites in the Green Belt then I would support it. However I think the bteer option is to ensure that all exisitng settlements in the north east are given given protectoni from urban sprawl.

Though not covered by the Green Belt/ Urban Sprawl issue the land in the north east should be recognised as to its beauty value and the contribution it makes to the view from the North Downs ANOB both from the East and the West.

Green belt should be saved possibly create more if possible

It is outrageous, divisive and completely unacceptable that in the previous draft plan, the Council sought to

---

**User Response: Text**

increase the Area of Opportunity to envelope Eccles village further whilst at the same time proposing to expand the Green Belt to protect East Malling.

Last time the proposal to expand the Green Belt boundaries only quoted the increase in Green Belt as a percentage. This is unacceptable. Any proposal to increase the Green Belt should be expressed as a percentage reduction of 'freely buildable land'. (That is land which is outside the Green Belt, that is not already built upon and that is not constrained by considerations such as flooding, ANOB, nature conservation, ancient woodland etc.)

I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road, East Malling between the built up areas of West Malling and East Malling .

You need to take some green belt land to use for your objectives in order to protect the rural communities as a whole.

It's a less of two evils for your existing rural communities.

Excessive development in this area will impact on traffic through Hadlow as well as major impacts on the rural service centres to the north.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Seems to be easiest to implement

Kings Hill is a far larger development than was originally planned, therefore the Green Belt around here should be extended

What I think is the proposal of the above would meant that LKings Hill would merge with West Malling and would in term merge with Leybourne/Medway Gap. The very opposite of this needs to happen to allow communities to protect their own and individual identity.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

Don't kill our green spaces

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

We have already suggested to you a specific type of development in the Kings Hill area. Funding would not be difficult to arrange.

The major point of this development would not be simply housing, but a specific type of community, with emphasis on wellness and post graduate education, specifically healthcare (nursing, carers, dental) plus I.T , and vocational training, etc. These skills are needed Kent wide, and the provision of this type of facility in such a development would bring benefit to the community and not be seen as another urban sprawl.

However the HMA at the south west part of the Borough should not be forgotten.

Why are you focusing on KIng's Hill? Such a well- planned development could benefit the Tonbridge area also.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

The Green Belt has always been a restraint to thoughtless and over-development of housing. It is often, but not exclusively, farmland. If we as a nation wish to be able to produce more of our food in the UK, then this farmland is vital.

The Green Belt should be extended to East Malling. This would prevent prevent the merging of local villages and Kings Hill, protect our open rural space and landscape and safeguard historic towns within the borough such as West Malling and East Malling as well as our villages some of which are already in a Conservation Area.

The Conservation Area of Offham should be extended.

Once the green belt is covered with tarmac, it is forever lost to everyone.

Particularly on the east of the Borough we have very little green belt remaining. This must be preserved at all costs

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

It is agreed and working at present

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

TMBC may not meet the 9 000 units shortfall without option 1 being considered.

However, Figure 10 potential development will add to an already over developed areas in Northeast of the Borough and will erode the anti-coalescence strategy adopted by TMBC to date.

There is not a good option.

The consideration of building on green belt sites is literally preposterous. There are many urban sites that can be utilised to meet the housing need rather than urbanise our rural heritage with multiple housing such as the suggested development in Plaxtol.

We must must ensure our council and government protects everything that makes our countryside and environment what it is. The even suggestion of this development is a fundamental let down of its constituents.

I would prefer we expand the green belt

Extending this boundary will lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt Land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

This options avoids creating one massive, sprawling mass of development between Kings Hill, West Malling and the area north, with the resultant overloading of roads and infrastructure. It also allows for the maintenance of separate identities for these locations.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

I have not selected an option here as I believe in a combination of 1& 2, we should extend the outer boundary of the Green Belt in proportion to the development within it AND a strategic policy aimed at protecting the clear separation, and therefore identity, of local settlements, also known as an anti-coalescence policy. We should not allow these settlements to develop into an urban sprawl.

The NPPF is very clear that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land area in the Borough

Need to protect the identity and character of local settlements.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land elsewhere in the Borough

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending the boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land area in the Borough

Village communities should be recognised and protected and should not be merged.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Eventually extended Green Belt boundaries will meet and the Green Belt will disappear.

---

**User Response: Text**

Protect more green space

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (option 1). This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect important green/ rural spaces and also safeguard the settling of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their conservation areas including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

This will lead to an unacceptable reduction in available Green Belt land.

This area of the green belt has been divided by a large and busy road. It does not make sense to extend the boundary across this road

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Combining Kings Hill and Medway Gap seems to make sense on the map given their proximity

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Protect more greenfield ...needed for food production

it is important to retain the existing green belt and AONB to preserve the nature and attractiveness of the region.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Eventually extended Green Belt boundaries will meet and the Green Belt will disappear.

Extending greenbelt would put further pressure on finding adequate space to build

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Protect more greenfield

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

See above

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

See answer to question 40

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Green belt needs to be preserved where possible, segregation of conervation should be maintained

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Too many houses in Tonbridge as it is.

One of the reasons that Tonbridge is a popular place to live is the balance between housing and green belt.

To preserve separate identities of towns and villages

With reservations - limited encroachment but protecting local settlements seems least bad

Protect more greenfield

I am concerned that the Hildenborough village will become an extension of Tonbridge, although I am equally concerned that there may be erosion of the green belt.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green belt land elsewhere in the borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

As stated above the green belt is put in place for a reason together with helping with carbon diluting and biodiversity

Maintain Green Belt Land



---

**User Response: Text**

If the areas were classified Green Belt they should remain. We cannot go changing boundaries just because it suits to do so.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the borough.

Coalescence could be provided with a minimal gap thus opening up considerable land for development.

The outer green belt area should only be extended if it is not at the expense of greenbelt elsewhere. It should not be "traded" such that previously greenbelt areas are lost.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough. If they do this, they will do it again in the future.

Protect the existing Greenbelt.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Protecting greenbelt is key. Extending greenbelt would provide further constraints on meeting the required housing numbers.

The Green Belt has been designated for a reason. If its boundary can be altered, there is effectively no

---

**User Response: Text**

requirement for a Green Belt as the designation becomes pointless.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Climate change is just the biggest reason

It is important to maintain the identity of the existing Rural settlements and avoiding a mass urban sprawl.

Prevent further, continuing urban sprawl.

I am not sure that the separation policy is sustainable or why it is necessary.

It is important to maintain the identity of the existing Rural settlements and avoiding a mass urban sprawl.

The Stage 2 Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances so Option 1 is supported as it appears to provide the most robust protection for the Broadwater area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.

I would select Option 1 to extend to the outer edge of the Green Belt eastwards from West Malling town to a new boundary at Wateringbury Road, East Malling. as envisaged in the last, abandoned Local Plan. This would provide strong protection for local countryside and farmland, it would preserve the setting of the many heritage features of this area of the Borough and also ensure that individual settlements, including the local hamlets, would not coalesce.

The consultation document suggests Option 2, an Anti-coalescence/ strategic gap policy as a reasonable alternative policy option which could provide similar safeguards as Option 1. I recognise that this option is given as the judgement of whether Exceptional Circumstances do exist to allow Option 1 to be implementable would be determined by a Planning Inspector, not TMBC itself. Option 3 would give no additional protection, which would risk inappropriate development in the area.

TMBC's Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances. So option 1 is supported as it appears to offer the most robust protection for the Broadwater area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Area.

A robust solution is required to ensure the status of the area is maintained . People need access to green space to maintain quality of life, and this needs to be ensured. The best and most versatile land in the borough needs to remain as such, to ensure food security.

Extending the Green Belt around Kings Hill would prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and

---

**User Response: Text**

West Malling. This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces.

Focus on greenbelt ensures continuity of use of productive farmland at a time when national food inflation is driven by the scale of imported goods while TMBC's analysis also overlooks the significant contribution that several of these particular sites bring to the local communities, through providing easy access to the beautiful Kentish landscape for exercise and building mental health, at a time when our nation is suffering from a major health crisis both in obesity and mental health and care.

No good reasons fro destroying green belt or altering boundaries to suit developers.

It is important to prevent the merging of historic villages and towns in order to preserve the unique character of the TMBC region.

There seems no priority or exceptional need to 'take' land from the green belt, with other options to progress and focus upon at least in the short/medium term. Longer term there is an acceptance that careful and sensitive consideration of suitable green space / green belt land for future development needs is inevitable, but that should not be a priority in the next 5-10 years.

Stops villages and towns merging and is in line with protecting the green belt and the green fields between communities.

Through consultation and if agreements can be made then option 1 will secure a buffer zone and create a buffer to protect the Green Belt.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction of green belt land elsewhere in the borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Green belt is not a progressive and fair policy for all our citizens.

Options 1 and 2. It should be ensured that gaps are maintained between villages and not turned into large towns.

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

To protect our villages and stop the expansion of urban sprawl

No should be left alone or made bigger for protect more green spaces.

they shouldn't be altered.

Site 59699 ME16 6NN

This is prime agricultural land of the highest quality - Grade 1, of the Best and Most Versatile Soils which is reducing throughout the country and is preventing the ability to produce our own crops. This site is in Green Belt, green field and is outside of the town development area and close to AONB. Road access is seriously limited.

Fartherwell Road is deemed a Quiet Lane, single carriageway and liable to flooding. Offham Road is narrow and has poor sight lines. Both roads are frequented by horse riders, walkers and cyclists

Site 59645 - ME19 6RE and Site 59714 ME19 6RD

These sites are also accessed from the Offham Road and would exceed the town boundary.

Both Offham and Fartherwell Roads have narrow and dangerous access at each end for existing traffic and would become critical with added development. At the town end all traffic is funnelled through the single carriageway where West Street joins the High Street. The opposite end of these roads have junctions with the Teston Road, which is small, has a 60mph speed limit and poor sight lines.

There are no support amenities available such as schools, GP and medical facilities and transport to support such a large development.

Sites in this location have previously been rejected as unsuitable for development for various practical and ethical reasons.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Looking to propose extending the greenbelt but at the same time proctoring that which is already within the greenbelt is a confusing and somewhat risky approach as we may lose greenbelt elsewhere or even dent the overall credibility of the plan - do we have exceptional need or not?

---

**User Response: Text**

An anti-coalescence approach will still provide protection against villages and towns merging without introducing the risk of losing green belt land elsewhere

Avoid urban sprawl and protect high grade high yield agricultural land at all costs considering the uncertainties of the world

To avoid urban sprawl and protect agricultural land.

Ultimately we would end up with vast urban areas and villages would lose their identity if the Green Belt and adjacent areas are not protected. There are still areas of unproductive and unused land e.g. quarries and brownfield sites that could be utilised for housing.

Does Option 1 related to the hatched area on the plan? if so in truly exceptional circumstances when all other options including building out existing planning approvals have been satisfied.

I do not support the use of the greenbelt particularly to join together two villages and make an urban area by stealth.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Maintain the green gaps between towns and villages to stop them merging into one big unidentified residential area.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land elsewhere in the borough.

We would refer to our answer provided at Question 40. In addition, the immediate outer boundary of the Green Belt would be defined as edge of settlement which concurs with a number of strategic growth objectives as outlined within the Local Plan. Edge of settlement sites represent the future evolution of settlements are sustainable in their nature by virtue of the fact they adjoin the existing settlement.

---

**User Response: Text**

Support British agriculture. We need to be more food self sufficient

I **support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

It would be a move to reducing the Green Belt.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

It is important to maintain the separate identities of settlements rather than allowing them to become an urban sprawl

You cant just build on green belt or AONB because its presence is inconvenient.

need to keep separation of rural communities for the long term

Greenbelt should absolutely not be built on.

Greenbelt should not be built on, there is plenty of other areas that can be developed without destroying our lovely countryside and environment.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

More robust and resilient as covered by legislation

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

it is about setting up boundaries that then are fully protected (by local plan if possible) so it may be option 2 does work - but really probably more detail is needed to understand implications fully.

Extending the boundary would lead to an reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough

Villages should retain their individual character and identity

The option selected is the best solution for maintaining the beauty in the borough and concentrating development within already built up areas that offer ample opportunity for meeting reasonable housing and business requirements.

keeping the status quo harms nobody.

Changing boundaries always produces winners and losers. Lets keep what we have

I would support an extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Watringbury Road East Malling between the built up areas of West and East Malling as this would

prevent the merging of local villages and Kings Hill

protect the open rural landscape

and safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their conservation areas including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Protect Greenbelt is key.

I would support preservation of and respect for the existing Green Belt. Extending the Green Belt seems impractical given housing needs. I understand the aim of anti-coalescence but not how that policy could be implemented in practice.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction on Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will likely result in an undesirable reduction in green belt land area elsewhere in the Borough

It contains towns with brownfield sites

It is vital that Medway Gap Development does not go any further towards Kings Hill and West Malling.  
Cease.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land area elsewhere in the borough

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirably reduction in  
Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.



---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

I dont think you can change a policy as important as the green belt.

This is a lovely area to live, with many quiet, green walks and quiet, winding roads. Many people have worked hard to afford houses overlooking greenery and fields. Building on any of space that is currently green belt land in order to please government quotas would be criminal. To declare it due to 'exceptional circumstances' would be a lie.

More housing won't help fix current house prices, or the ability to get a mortgage.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the borough.

To attempt to limit the ongoing infilling of rural land to the east and south of West Malling.

No response

See above answers

Extending tis boundary will probably lead to undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the borough.

To give a wider option for spreading development more evenly across the Borough rather than concentrating in the North of the Borough. The existing constraints are having an adverse effect on the villages in the North and the fact that infrastructure is given little consideration.

---

**User Response: Text**

As above.

I believe more housing within walking distance of West Malling Station is a necessary part of a local plan that delivers the additional dwellings required. Although I do not like to propose more development in any rural area, locating new housing at the rail hubs is the most sustainable solution and West Malling Station is isolated from existing settlements. The importance of the setting of the historic settlement at West Malling is recognised so expansion on this side needs to be controlled but the buffer of the existing Ashton Way would ensure any development on the Kings Hill side was completely screened. With cycle and pedestrian tunnels, the Kings Hill site could be extended north up to the station, increasing its connectivity and sustainability and benefitting from the excellent network of cycle and pedestrian paths. The only proviso would be to create a woodland buffer to the north to prevent coalescence with the Medway Gap. Expanding the Green belt to prevent new housing across this whole area would be lovely, but it runs contrary to the imposed needs of the borough for new housing land and would only force this into other areas of the Green belt where it would be less sustainable and incur greater damage.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Don't touch the green belt boundaries

We need to extend the outer boundary of the GREEN BELT not encroach upon it.

We need to protect the greenfield sites.

If this is the most effective way of enhancing protection to the identity of local settlements and historic places.

To help preserve the separation between settlements and protect the landscape and individual character of each.

Protecting the Green Belt is a must. Extending it would provide further constraints on housing

I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (option 1). This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect important green/ rural spaces and also safeguard the settling of the

---

**User Response: Text**

historic towns of West and East Malling and their conservation areas including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

Maintaining green space between existing villages is crucial to avoid destroying the unique character they each possess and of the green spaces themselves, which are also important habitats for local wildlife or increasingly essential good quality agricultural land.

Having continuous buildings stretched out over large areas is just awful. Green space is important for people's well being and you need space to plant vegetation and trees to mitigate co2 levels. Also by breaking up the housing a sense of community can be achieved,

changes to metropolitan greenbelt require exceptional circumstances

Protection of greenbelt is vital. Extending greenbelt will provide further constraints on housing numbers

Extending the boundary will probably lead to a reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the borough.

No response

Once changed, it cannot be restored

Option 2/strategic gaps are an established policy that can easily be implemented. Changes to the long-established Metropolitan Green Belt are difficult to achieve as they require 'exceptional circumstances' to justify changes.

Keep protected green belt land

I think that further development of the Kings Hill, Medway Gap, Snodland and Walderslade areas are appropriate but these should not be allowed to coalesce with each other.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

If they do it this time, they will do it again in the future.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

It is vital to protect Green Belt and more greenfield needs to be protected.

It is shortsighted to keep building on land that is green and to cut down trees.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Reduction in Green Belt across the Borough

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of

---

**User Response: Text**

local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

better use of current brownfield and derelict comes first

Tonbridge is a popular place to live because of the balance between its housing and green belt.

It is unfortunate that the Green Belt's natural extension when first put in place did not extend to cover the cross-hatched area, which is an area of great natural beauty and a key buffer against the envelopment of West Malling in the Maidstone conurbation.

The Green Belt should be extended to protect this area, which contains Ancient Woodlands and great biodiversity.

We use it often for cycling and walking.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

This area needs to be protected to preserve the natural habitat, historic fabric and valuable agricultural land. In addition the carrying capacity of the settlements in this area has already been exceeded and the infrastructure of the area already can't cope. Development needs to be focused elsewhere in the borough and this area needs to be preserved.

---

**User Response: Text**

Development north of Kings Hill is inevitable, and it is probably the most appropriate place for local development. A strategic gap between it and Medway Gap should be provided.

green belt should be extended to prevent settlements of Kings Hill, East Malling, West Malling merging into one urban town with no green space.

Excessive development in this area will impact on traffic through Hadlow.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land area elsewhere in the borough

Option 2 seems like a reasonable compromise. It would also hopefully still allow for wildlife corridors between the urban conurbations.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land elsewhere in the borough.

To preserve what is left of Malling, which seems to have borne the brunt of development in the borough in recent years, the green belt should be extended to cover the hatched area in figure 10. At the very least, the integrity of local settlements should be protected.

[x ] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1) Kings Hill is a beautiful garden village which will be destroyed by these multiple proposals to fill every piece of green landscape with housing. There will be nowhere to walk in nature and the only option for exercise will be to pound the pavements with or without dogs.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

We need more green space not less

---

**User Response: Text**

No. The strategic level is just part of the consideration and site specific considerations are critically important. Exceptional circumstances could only be determined after a careful study of the proposed site and what the exceptional benefits are that the development proposal brings compared with the disbenefits. All aspects of the individual site must be considered and each site is different. For example the building of significant numbers of dwellings on a particular site will often cause some or all of the following disbenefits. 1. The dwellings will significantly increase traffic which may overload primary network junctions. 2. The impacted junctions cause crawling traffic and decreases air quality, potentially exacerbating AQMAs. 3. Significant developments can infill between separate village communities, effectively urbanising rural areas, which is the opposite of the purpose of the Green Belt policy.

Individual areas need to be able to keep their identity.

Protecting the Green Belt is a must. Extending it would provide further constraints on housing.

Protecting the Green Belt is a must. Extending it would provide further constraints on housing

The original purpose of the Greenbelt is to protect green open space around urban areas and to keep urban sprawl in check. Now it also serves to protect against air pollution, climate change , providing habitats for wildlife, protecting woodland, supporting health and wellbeing. This protection should be just that: 'protection' and should not be so easily passed over.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Please answer to question 41.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Protecting the greenbelt is paramount. Extending it would provide further constraints on meeting the required housing numbers.

Extension of the green belt boundary would put increased pressure on land outside the green belt in the borough.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I am supportive of Option 1 to extend the outer boundary of the Green Belt to preserve the distinction of three separate communities - West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill. Otherwise the prime Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land will be lost permanently and this cannot be undone and will be an irreversible tragedy. The distinct communities are already under the threat of coalescence especially between Kings Hill and West Malling following the inability of TMBC to prevent this because no extant Local Plan exists. My preference is to see the Green Belt boundary extended east from the A228 to the north-south road from Larkfield (starting at New Road) to Wateringbury (Red Hill).

If a strategic case for exceptional circumstances is finally accepted, then an anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy is my second option within the Green Belt.

The 1st two Options listed in Q42 do not seem to wholly fulfill T & M Councils legal(?) obligations to achieve "the fundamental aim of the Green Belt being to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open" as denoted in the NPPF guidance policies.

We expect T & M Council to fulfill their legal duty with respect to the NPPF guidance policies which are very clear that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Thereby adopting a strategic policy aimed at protecting the clear separation, and therefore identity, of local settlements such as Wateringbury & adjacent settlements of Pizen Well & Teston, known as an anti-coalescence policy.

a strategic policy aimed at protecting the clear separation, and therefore identity, of local settlements, also known as an anti-coalescence policy.

If the Green Belt is built on, particularly for housing (rather than for hospitals) it cannot be unbuilt upon - therefore the T & M as local planning authority have not achieved the fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl.



---

**User Response: Text**

Reducing green belt and agricultural land

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Protect what we have as green belt but extending it further would make it even harder to find appropriate sites for new housing. There has to be a compromise.

Extending this boundary will most likely lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Increase where possible to enhance the quality/character of the area.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

If we create a tool for removing the protection, the priority of brown belt development will drop because it will be more cost effective for developers to go for new green sites. Absolute measures for exceptional circumstances are impossible as they are always subjective. You would need to place a heavy limit on the proportion of Green belt to be allowed to be lost over a 15 year period to drive developers to the brown fields land. I note that no assessment of potential brownfield development sites has been included with this survey. I think the Local plan should undertake such a survey.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

To allow housing considerations to be spread across all of the borough and not the focus of the north and east of the borough.

Why haven't other areas of Green Belt been explored? Why has only one area of Green Belt been put forward when around 70% of the borough is Green Belt. The further urbanisation of the north of the borough will impact air quality which is already poor in places and the highway infrastructure is already congested. The sustainable

---

**User Response: Text**

travel options for this area are poor.

There are better areas with more infrastructure, facilities and access that could be developed instead of green belt. There is no need to use the green belt to develop on. Why is only the green belt area between Kings Hill and the Medway Gap being considered, Figure 10 in section 5.11.12 only indicates this area for development on Green Belt, nowhere else in the borough!!

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land elsewhere in the Borough.

There is a real danger that it all becomes a real urban sprawl with hugh detrimental impact on the area and quality of life of the inhabitants. I also question how the infrastructure could cope including roads and utilities.

To be left undisturbed.

No comprehensive Green Belt study has been commissioned. The Green Belt was established for good reason and that reason has not changed. Biodiversity, zero carbon will not be improved by the loss of Green Belt

There is ample land that is not Greenbelt that should be built on first. Most of that is Greenfield that provides non-coalescence of settlement, and all is crucial for our food security

Extending the boundary will probably lead to a reduction in green belt land elsewhere in the Borough.

I would like the green belt to stay as is, to separate the villages in the area.

keep sprawl within existing built areas

Green environment must be close to all communities, not just the lucky few.

---

**User Response: Text**

It must be protected

I have not understood any argument from the text for altering the Green Belt in this area. This would be extremely controversial and in any case Planners would already have to consider e.g. the setting of the Abbey.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics .In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated EAST PECKHAM , SNOLL HATCH and HALE STREET **MUST** be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas

i am concerned about further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.

An anti-coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para. 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

Extending this boundary might probably lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land elsewhere in the borough .

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

More creative thinking about alternative options will be encouraged if you exclude Green Belt.

Preserve our green belt at all costs. If you seek to build on it, you will destroy this area forever.

---

**User Response: Text**

I don't understand this question. I think King's hill should have an un-built band before it joins up with Medway Gap.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

To try and preserve the identity of settlements / areas.

The development of housing along the A20 from Larkfield to Maidstone is a case in point. The villages have coalesced into one long slug of bricks and mortar with any individual character or identity swept away, although there are probably vestiges of the old settlements somewhere there. I think it's important for residents to feel an attachment for the place they live in, "Pride of Place", as the Civic Trust used to term it.

The 'Great Wen of London' springs to mind. Many parts of London are now trying to reset their identity by reclaiming their old village names or adopting new ones, eg "twixt the commons" – the area between Clapham and Wandsworth Commons or "Ladywell Village" in Lewisham.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

An anti coalescence policy is considered  
vital in existing areas of green belt that

---

**User Response: Text**

already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas. I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

Green belt should be protected at all costs.

Green belt to be protected at all costs along with AONB

Sorry, I could not determine the difference in Strategic Options based on the content of the report.

Protect more greenfield.

No comment

The Green Belt must be protected at all costs

AS previously stated i do agree with messing about with the Green belt i any shape or form.

---

**User Response: Text**

I have chosen Option 1, as this provides the greatest protection for West Malling. However, I feel strongly that it is also of vital importance to preserve prime agricultural land, open spaces, woodland and Greenfield/Green Belt areas; these are a haven for wildlife and crucial in the prevention of further habitat loss. Also, there is a need to protect the heritage sites and the quality of the built environment in and around the Town, which are important for both local residents and visitors alike.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular, Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

Maintaining open spaces and distinct local towns and villages should be paramount.

I have highlighted my reasons throughout.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by

I agree with both option 1 and 2 but can't pick both.

I've explained above why the green belt should be expanded in north east and east of the borough at the expense of small pockets of carefully guided new settlements in other areas.

Extending this boundary is likely to lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough. If they do it this time, they will do it again in the future.

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Keeping green belt is important for wildlife and keeping the country side intact

we need to protect our countryside and rural areas as they are an essential part of our environment and identity. The alternative is a relentless expansion and merging of villages and towns into a greater urban field

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

I consider that this is the most effective way of preventing coalescence.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in the Green belt land elsewhere in the borough

It is already large enough to work if it is respected

Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated that East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate. Also Peckham Bush should be kept separate from East Peckham.

The Green Belt has a critical role and should be protected for the future.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect**

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Must protect green belt

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

As before, the original green belt is now out of date

Extending this boundary would likely lead to reductions in Green Belt area elsewhere in the borough that may have a worse environmental impact.



---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough. If they do it this time, they will do it again in the future.

The green belt is sacrosanct and should not under any circumstances be altered.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I SUPPORT THE GREEN BELT BEING EXTENDED AROUND KINGS HILL, EAST MALLING AND WEST MALLING TO PROTECT THE INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER OF THE SETTLEMENTS AND IMPORTANT GREEN SPACES.

It's a slippery slope of tinkering with the green belt. Take a bit now and that will justify taking more at a later date. Eventually no green belt.

Extending the boundary could lead to a reduction in green belt land elsewhere

Offham Parish Council supports Option 1, to extend the outer boundary of the Green Belt to preserve the distinction of three separate communities - West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill. Otherwise prime agricultural land will be lost permanently and this cannot be undone. The three communities are already under the threat of coalescence following TMBC's inability to prevent this because no extant local plan exists. Our preference is that the outer Green Belt boundary be extended to the east from A228 to the north-south road from Larkfield (starting from New Road) to Watringbury (Red Hill). We strongly support West Malling and East Malling Parish Councils with this issue. West Malling's rural and historic setting must be protected by extension of the Green Belt to encircle it.

Extending this boundary will lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Hadlow does not have the facilities to support the new housing. Adding that, the village cannot handle the traffic that the extra housing would add to the congestion.

Strategic gaps are easy to implement. Rural communities should remain separate with circumscribed borders.

The Metropolitan Green Belt boundary was created and determined by the purposes of stopping the sprawl and coalescence of settlements around London. If the boundary is extended further it will put further pressure on land

---

**User Response: Text**

beyond the new boundary. The issues of concern for requiring an extension of the boundary to protect Historic building character, Agricultural land and Biodiversity can all be conserved and enhanced through local planning policies, the NPPF and statutory provisions. Ensuring that sufficient allocations and strong development management policies are provided (and enforced) in the Local Plan should ensure protection of these assets.

A large development in the indicated area would be likely to result in further heavy traffic and congestion driving through Hadlow.

Excessive development in this area will impact on traffic through Hadlow

Seems a reasonable compromise for preventing coalescence of existing settlements

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

The boundaries should not be changed, to protect our county, borough and villages. As a last resort, if the boundaries have to be altered, then look at altering them in the south of the borough, as the north east of the borough has accounted for a massive proportion of the housing development in the last 20 years.

As identified in 4.3.8: it will protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, protect and enhance the borough's landscape and townscape character and quality, protect and enhance the cultural heritage, and conserve and enhance soil resources and guard against land contamination.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

I support the extension of Green belt to be around the existing boundaries of Kings Hill development. This will stop the expansion and eventual joining up with West Malling , East Malling and Mereworth.

I would support the extension of the green belt around Kings Hill to ensure the characters of Kings Hill, West Malling and East Malling are kept and that they don't become one large, amalgamated area.

---

**User Response: Text**

An anti-coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of the greenbelt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the development framework part 6.3.35 states East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. there is therefore previously established policies to support the ongoing and continued protection of an anti-coalition policy being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I was there and about the further risk of additional flooding and run-off created as a result of new developments within the area.

That just passes the problem to other green belt areas.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

There are existing brownfields sites to develop and areas of existing urban development that could benefit from improvements and further development.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

It is a slippery slope to further reductions in the Green belt

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

The Green Belt should be unaltered. Many people have made strategic decisions about their lives based on the permanence of these boundaries, and those decisions should be respected.

It is vital that existing population centres are protected from becoming a single vast conglomeration. The rural gap between Kings Hill, Leybourne, West and East Malling etc must be maintained. And similarly likewise to the south of Snodland.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

I fear that any adjustment to the green belt would open the flood gates and it would be lost very quickly.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Medway Council does not have a preference for any of the three options. Medway Council would want to be engaged in further assessment work on greenbelt view should sites fall in close proximity to Medway boundary.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

See answer to Q41. Extending the Green Belt might be good, but I do not have the information on which to form a considered opinion.

As above

Preserve our greenbelt at all costs.

Changes to the Metropolitan Greenbelt require exceptional circumstances

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Option 1 is supported as it appears to provide a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough. We have little green belt land left locally and any reduction will forever change the look feel use and biodiversity of this land.

In respect to Hildenborough, the distinction between Hildenborough including Hilden Park and Tonbridge should be maintained.

See answer to Q41. Extending the Green Belt might be good, but I do not have the information on which to form a considered opinion.

Option 3, provided the plan is revised after 2 years and adjusted to the new situation

Stop villages and towns merging

Our countryside is precious and is an intrinsic part of the character of East Malling Village. It provides a physical separation between villages so that each retains its own identity. It provides leisure opportunities which are vital for health and well-being. Critically, agricultural land feeds us. The Green Belt Area around East Malling needs to be extended to prevent the village joining with Kings Hill and West Malling

At the time of the now withdrawn plan the first proposals were to extend the Green Belt eastwards in this area out to the A228 so that all of West Malling Town would be within the Green Belt boundary.

The current boundary follows the line of what is now the A228 so it cuts through the town. At that time the West Malling by pass now part of the A228 route did not exist so it could not be used as a feature to follow. An extension out to that line would mean that the whole of West Malling conservation area would be within the Green Belt and it would preserve the setting of the town. It would also provide a clear boundary that exists on the ground and one that is permanent. This would accord with the idea that the Green Belt should be a long term designation. The present boundary with parts of the Town within the Green Belt and others excluded does not make sense. It would also encompass manor Park Country Park which is part and parcel of the Town and help keep a green separation between the Town and the built-up part of Leybourne. And it would include Eden Farm so protecting the setting of Malling Abbey in accordance with two recent planning appeal decisions.

However, in response to those proposals the Parish Council and others argued for a further extension of the Green

---

**User Response: Text**

Belt eastwards so as to prevent the coalescence of East Malling and West Malling and also with an expanded Kings Hill.

This was accepted and the then draft plan broadly extended the Green Belt out to Wateringbury Road, East Malling and up to what was proposed as an extension to Kings Hill northwards as far as Pikey Lane. The Parish Council supported the principle of such an extension and employed a planner in support of an extension. However, that point in the examination of the plan was never reached and the draft plan was subsequently withdrawn.

Accordingly, the Parish Council renews its support for an extension of the Green Belt eastwards from the West Malling By Pass and refers to the evidence previously submitted. It would protect the countryside between the three communities including the network of quiet Lanes and rural public paths, the conservation areas within it, and continue to provide a “green” area appreciated by the residents of the adjoining built up areas.

It is noted the questions refer to an Anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy which is perhaps seen as an alternative way to keep the West Malling, East Malling and the growing community of Kings Hill separate. However, such a policy lacks the permanence of a Green Belt extension. And I am unsure if such policies can be adopted given that the strategic Gap policy that did exist in previous separating Medway Gap and Maidstone was said to be no longer a policy government supported which has resulted in the developments along Hermitage lane, Aylesford both in this borough and Maidstone where such a policy previously applied.

Since the draft plan the area known as Forty Acres, East Malling which would have been within such a Green Belt was granted permission for 250 homes on appeal to the government, mainly and disappointingly because the Borough had no 5 year land supply or an up to-date Local Plan. Accordingly, that site cannot be included although the “country park” it plans at the Lucks Road end could be included.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will most likely lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Option 1 and Option 2. Protect more greenfield

Extending this boundary will lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land

Good to preserve coalescence without adding to MGB constraint.

We need to further protect the existing land outside of the current green belt boundary for future generations. It is

---

**User Response: Text**

important for anti-coalescence.

It is important for local communities to maintain their own defined areas separated by green belt and not become one joined up town.

Options should protect village communities

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

This would give the opportunity to design and construct "model villages", for want of a better phrase.

The Green Belt has a critical role and should be protected for the future.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

N/a

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

The loss of Greenbelt will be totally detrimental to the area and all those that have moved ther because of the green belt protection.

Extending the boundary might result in a negative impact to another Green Belt land area in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

We think that it would be helpful if the council could firstly assess its position relating to the current needs assessment given the options that have been put before it. Once that is clearer then it would make it easier to consider what would be further required by way of change in order to achieve the required development outcome. We hope that makes sense but we feel that any consideration of changing the Green Belt should only be undertaken if it is absolutely necessary.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1).

This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces.

Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

‘Strategic Gaps’ are an established policy that can easily be implemented. Changes to the long established Metropolitan Green Belt are difficult to achieve as they require ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify changes.

We should value the separation of our rural communities, not just in the north east but in areas between Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green, Ightham and Wrotham.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

**Protect the green belt**

I would like to see a priority in maintaining distinct, separate communities which I believe is what makes the borough so attractive



---

**User Response: Text**

Protection of the Green Belt

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

We should value the separation of our unique villages.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough. Green Belt land was created for a reason and it would threaten urban sprawl on these areas. The effect of removing free movement for wild life in these areas would be awful.

Prevent urban sprawl. Preserve agricultural resource. Encourage recreational activities, bio-diversity and ecology.

**Option 2** - Supports an anti-coalescence policy (stops villages and towns merging) and is in line with protecting the green belt and the green fields between communities. Extending the green belt is another way of doing this but brings risk of losing green belt elsewhere to enable the extension.

See response to Q2

By extending the outer boundary it encroaches on the villages of West and East Malling and they will become engulfed and lost as small communities.

It is important that the local communities remain separated and do not become a conurbation, stretching from Maidstone to Offham or even onto Borough Green in a ribbon development. This allows for green pathways for wildlife and food production.

An increase to the green belt has significant local support (via WM parish Council).

---

**User Response: Text**

I select Strategic Option 3 as leaving the existing outer Green Belt boundary unaltered is absolutely preferable to removing some existing Green Belt area to accommodate extending the boundary.

As above. Should have exemption from Parliament to reduce housing to keep green belt intact.

Extending this boundary will likely lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in Borough.

Green Belt needs to be protected. Utilise the already concreted areas first.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street

Preferable for no change but if this is the only way overly inflated targets can be met then option 2 would be a fall-back position.

There are no exceptional circumstances to justify the addition of more land into the green belt in this area.

The distinction between Hildenborough including Hilden Park and Tonbridge should be maintained.

‘Strategic Gaps’ are an established policy that can easily be implemented. Changes to the long established Metropolitan Green Belt are difficult to achieve as they require ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify changes.

We should value the separation of our rural communities, not just in the north east but in areas between Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green, Ightham and Wrotham.

Undecided

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the

---

**User Response: Text**

Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to a reduction of green belt land

To counter balance the lost green belt

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

If you change the boundaries now, that opens the door to unlimited development and must be avoided.

No Response

See previous answers in particular to Q 4 and 38

The concept of a green wedge between communities allows them to retain their individual identity and reinforces community spirit and cooperation.

It would also be a good discipline even within the Green Belt to resist ribbon development along, for example, the M26, A25, A228.

No response

It may be that in the UK, people's houses are too culturally important. In Spain for example, most people live in apartments but they spend more time socialising.

I fully endorse Offham Parish Council's view that the Green Belt land should be fiercely protected and indeed that the Outer Belt should be extended eastwards towards Wateringbury Road keeping open land between the historic settlements of East and West Malling.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

See above.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

see answer to Q40

Areas of East Peckham have been identified and the Local development framework para 6.3.35 states they should be kept separate. the local plan has identified these areas as potential development areas which is going against this.

I am really concerned that areas that have not previously flooded will be adversely affected by any further development especially any larger scale developments like those we have seen in Paddock Wood causing issues.

Don't want to loose the Green Belt

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extend Green Belt round Kings Hill and between E & W Malling for following reasons:

- Otherwise there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands critical for the wellbeing of local residents and which provide important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming.

- Risk of coalescence of settlements of Kings Hill, East Malling & West Malling into one massive urban conurbation.

To allow housing considerations to be spread across all of the borough and not the focus of the north and east of the borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

no comment

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Green Belt should be flexible - e.g. no net loss overall, so if some Green Belt used for development, more land should be added to it in lieu.

See previous comments

This is a confusing question as the map does not fully show the existing green belt.

We should protect the Green Belt as a priority

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street

Berkeley has significant concerns about the proposed strategy presented here and seeks some urgent clarification.

---

### User Response: Text

The 'strategic gap' identified Figure 10 in the consultation document appears to include Broadwater Farm (**site ID: 59740**), which is currently being considered for housing through the application process, and which is identified indicatively as a "focus for growth" in four of the five spatial distribution options identified in section 4 of the consultation document. Whilst it is possible this is a mapping issue, there is clearly an inconsistency between those options and the allocation of Broadwater Farm which was previously supported by the Council.  
**Berkeley objects to a gap policy being applied to the Broadwater Farm site.**

Berkeley also objected to the Council's approach to proposing Green Belt extensions in this area in the previous (now withdrawn plan). It was Berkeley's opinion that the case put forward by the Council for its proposed extension to the Green Belt did not amount to exceptional circumstances; they were nothing more than an assessment of function and performance. The same arguments apply in so far as Option 1 (extend the outer boundary of the Green Belt) and Option 2 (anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy) are concerned.

Berkeley acknowledges that important areas of countryside need to be protected and that there will be locations where it is appropriate to maintain separation between settlements. There is, however, no need or justification in so far as the land north of King Hill is concerned. This area (i.e., Broadwater Farm (**site ID: 59740**)) is a prime and sustainable location for a strategic level of development and one where a general countryside policy and/or an appropriately worded site-specific policy can ensure that any issues around coalescence can be addressed.

Accordingly, Berkeley would urge the Council to adopt Option 3 – "no change – leave existing outer Green belt unaltered."

Historic village communities must be protected.

Protecting greenbelt is key. Extending greenbelt would provide further constraints on meeting the required housing numbers.

You just seem to allow Kings Hill to expand further and further. If you allow development on Broadwater Farm this destroys green space and valuable agricultural land. You seem determined to concrete over all land between Hermitage Lane and West Malling!

Once breached it sets a dangerous precedent

Green belt is an essential character of the region

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings

---

**User Response: Text**

Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the Wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extensions, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barnes, Springetts Hill and Well Street

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Stops villages and towns merging protecting the green fields and green belt between communities

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending the boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land elsewhere in the Borough.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**[x] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**[X] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).**

**[x] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**



---

**User Response: Text**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and Important green spaces (Option 1)

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.

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

---

**User Response: Text**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

[ X] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

[x] **I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

[x] **I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

[x] **I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

[x] **I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1). I moved to Kings Hill eleven years ago to have a family. My wife and I felt the development was prestigious due to being reasonably small, felt like a community, was surrounded by green belt and a great place to have children as it had the feeling of being safe. Over the years, we have watched the area expand and the prestigious feeling is dwindling away. In the eleven

---

**User Response: Text**

years, it has begun to feel very over crowded. We are lucky to live on the original phase one however even this will be under threat with the above proposals. Such a shame. We do not want TMBC to build on any green belt no matter where it is. Please consider using derelict land or building on land where dwellings can be knocked down and rebuilt.. we do not need any more developments on our Borough. We are truly ruining the beautiful English countryside and I am feeling sad for our children. Soon there will be no green spaces.

Option 1 and Option 2

**Protect more greenfield**

This would have the dual benefit of offsetting some losses required to meet needs where they support sustainable patterns of development, whilst also providing the strategic policy means to respect the gap between, and separate identity of, Kings Hill and the Medway Gap.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

There are no exceptional circumstances that warrant the inclusion of more land within the Green Belt.

support Option 1 to extend the Green Belt to help protect the green spaces of the north east of the borough around West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill.

Green Belt

We endorse and support Option 1 to extend the Green Belt.

...especially to protect the “green wedge”, providing a continuous corridor connecting WM Manor Park via New Barns hamlet, and bridleway through Broadwater and along the ancient route to East Malling parish.

This route is a valuable local amenity, much used by dog walkers, horse riders, people taking their exercise, and as a route for walking or cycling across country between communities.

The area already provides for the publicly acknowledged and recognised need for outdoor breathing space vital for mental and physical well-being.

Any development within this area inevitably severs the continuity of the landscape and irrevocably alters the nature, ambience and quietude of the surrounding environment.

---

### User Response: Text

The proposed suggestion for playing fields and green spaces amongst the housing would be built at the *expense* of existing green space, pathways and rural landscape (with the addition, of course, of air, water, noise and light pollution.)

There are no existing exceptional circumstances to justify adding further land into the Green Belt in this area. It is understood that doubts were expressed about this policy approach in the examination of the previous TMBC Local Plan. Our view is that whilst exceptional circumstances exist to support the release of Green Belt land, they do not exist to support an extension to the Green Belt. A general countryside policy would provide sufficient policy protections against unplanned development.

### Option 3

**An anti coalescence policy is vital to help keep green belt.**

**East Peckham should be kept separate from Snoll Hatch and Hale Street.**

**Building in these areas could cause additional flooding.**

The Metropolitan Green Belt boundary was created and determined by the purposes of stopping the sprawl and coalescence of settlements around London. If the boundary is extended further it will put further pressure on land beyond the new boundary. The issues of concern for requiring an extension of the boundary to protect Historic building character, Agricultural land and Biodiversity can all be conserved and enhanced through local planning policies, the NPPF and statutory provisions. Ensuring that sufficient allocations and strong development management policies are provided (and enforced) in the Local Plan should ensure protection of these assets.

**Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.**

**An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.**

**I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new**

---

**User Response: Text**

**development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.**

**East Peckham and Hale Street have a recent history of flooding – it is essential that flood plain (safe flooding area) capacity is maintained and that houses are not built on areas prone to flooding, or which may displace flooding to other areas not previously affected.**

The Metropolitan Green Belt boundary was created and determined by the purposes of stopping the sprawl and coalescence of settlements around London. If the boundary is extended further, it will put further pressure on land beyond the new boundary. The issues of concern for requiring an extension of the boundary to protect Historic building character, Agricultural land and Biodiversity can all be conserved and enhanced through local planning policies, the NPPF and statutory provisions. Ensuring that sufficient allocations and strong development management policies are provided (and enforced) in the Local Plan should ensure protection of these assets.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Gladman do not consider that Option 1 is suitable. The option to extend the outer Green Belt to designated land that is suitable for development and could be readily and immediately used to meet the housing requirements of the borough, adjacent to sustainable settlements, would be inconsistent with the majority of the spatial strategy options outlined earlier in the document. The NPPF is clear that any changes to Green Belt boundaries must have regard to their intended permanence in the longterm, so that they can endure beyond the plan period; increasing the Green Belt in this iteration of the Local Plan would reduce the amount of unconstrained land available in the future to address future development needs.

Option 2 suggests an anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy. Gladman disagree with these designations in principle, however, any policy the Council consider necessary should be appropriately worded to ensure flexibility. The designation should not be used to arbitrarily restrict sustainable locations for development coming forward and policy wording must reflect this.

However, Gladman consider that Option 3 is the most suitable. In an area that is already highly constrained by Green Belt, it would not be appropriate to further constrain areas that are the most suitable and sustainable for housing development.

Gladman would suggest that this land remains undesignated and favoured for Tonbridge & Malling Local Plan Reg. 18 Representations

25

sustainable development. Development sites can be delivered in this area without causing coalescence and can be suitably designed to meet the wider objectives of a strategic gap policy such as openness and preserving the character and appearance of the settlement edge, therefore a restrictive policy is not required.

---

## User Response: Text

- **Option 1** is supported as the TMBC's Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances.
- **Option 1** is supported as it appears to provide the most robust protection for the area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.
- We support extending the Green Belt eastwards from West Malling town to a new boundary at Wateringbury Road, East Malling. as envisaged in the last, abandoned Local Plan which would:
  - Provide strong protection for local green spaces, countryside and farmland
  - Preserve the setting of the many heritage features
  - Prevent coalescence of local individual settlements, including the local hamlets
- Should TMBC's rationale for "Exceptional Circumstances" allowing the redrawing of Green Belt boundaries be rebutted then Option 2 Anti-coalescence/ strategic gap policy may be a reasonable alternative policy option which could provide similar safeguards to Option 1
- Option 3 would give no additional protection and is not supported
- A comparison of Options 1 and 2 would have been useful for consultees to understand the differences between them
- The new Local Plan must provide new protection to the Carnation Green Space and local areas
- Table 4.4 of Chapter 4 of the Interim SA report lists potential merits of different options to prevent the merging of settlements but there is no account of interruption or degradation of water features such as the springs which could result from development of the area.
- TMBC is in possession of a full hydrogeology report by GWP of the area clearly showing a primary aquifer running through the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation area which:
  - Any new development would damage
  - Is significant to the success of Broadwater Farm in its fruit growing
  - Is a vital supply of water to Ditton Stream which Well Street
  - Flood mitigation would be required if any building were to be anticipated.

Anti-coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular local development framework paragraph six point 3.35 stated E Peckham Snoll hatch and Hale St must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing continued protection or the anti coalescence policy being we maintain in respect of these areas of existing street green belt land. Parish council is concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off created a sort of new development affecting areas previously not impacted on flooding.

to extend the green belt will make it more difficult to meet housing targets it would also force development into less suitable areas. The risk of flooding is very low in the highlighted areas outside existing grow about. Discharge will be driven will be in to much wider rivers than can cope. The area has great transport links. Housing in this area will cheaper and therefore more affordable to those drug into purpose chest property. We very much need more affordable housing and less blood restful stop sending green but into the most sensible areas in bury in which develop would create many difficulties across the entire borough fell though seeking affordable housing.

Anti coalescence measures should be maintained in existing green belt areas. For example E Peckham consists of nine hammers each with its own identity and character. Current call policy states that hamlet should be kept



---

**User Response: Text**

separate and without info housing connecting with. 2016 tmbc green survey highlighted list with specific mention of keeping snow has stepped from the village centre. Rather than moving green belt boundaries and adopting anti coalescence policy on land that is not currently green belt it is vital current anti caresses policy a measures all maintained within a single number.

We have to date received 102 residents' feedback forms on this issue. 91 support the option of extending the Green Belt. 2 support the anti-coalescence policy, 3 supported either extending the Green Belt and/or the anti-coalescence policy and 6 support no change.

WMPC has been faced with three Appeals on Green Belt land in support of TMBC. We submitted Proof of Evidence from Kevin Goodwin setting out the ways in which extending the Green Belt boundary would meet the special circumstances required. See section 2 for the relevant paragraphs.

Option three will result in the further erosion of the countryside which separates West Malling from Kings Hill, East Malling, Larkfield and Leybourne, and these communities from one another.

Option two is an unknown policy which we have previously been advised is no longer allowed. As a result the strategic gap between Maidstone and Malling has been largely lost. It does not have the well known and enduring credibility, status and functions of the Green Belt ie. to prevent urban sprawl, protect historic towns, and preserve the openness of the countryside in the long term.

Option one has been supported by this Parish Council since the 1990's and we were extremely pleased to received TMBC support for the first time in the last iteration of the Local Plan.

In recent years the rural setting of West Malling has threatened by applications near to the station. It has been lessened by permissions for around 150 dwellings granted on King Hill, and the loss of Forty Acres to the east of the bypass. It is further threatened by the unresolved applications at the A20/A228 junction, and Broadwater Farm. All these lie within the unprotected eastern side of West Malling. The need for the extension of the Green Belt to encircle West Malling to protect its rural setting is both urgent and important.

TMBC's Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances, so Option 1 is supported as it appears to offer the most robust protection for the Broadwater Farm area, including anticoalescence / strategic gap policy, as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing market Area. A robust solution is required to ensure that the status of the area is maintained. People need access to green space to maintain quality of life, and this needs to be ensured. The best and most versatile land in the borough needs to remain as such to ensure food security.

Extending the Green Belt around Kings Hill would prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling. This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect the important green spaces.

TMBC's Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances, so Option 1 is supported as it appears to offer the most robust protection for the Broadwater Farm area, including anti-coalescence / strategic gap policy, as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and

---

**User Response: Text**

Tonbridge Housing market Area. A robust solution is required to ensure that the status of the area is maintained. People need access to green space to maintain quality of life, and this needs to be ensured. The best and most versatile land in the borough needs to remain as such to ensure food security.

Extending the Green Belt around Kings Hill would prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling. This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect the important green spaces.

To retain as far as possible the existing rural character of the areas outside the urban settlements and their immediate environs

51. Option 1 : Extend the outer boundary of the Green Belt : there is no strategic or policy case for extending the outer boundary of the Green Belt. Nothing in the NPPF suggests that the loss of the Green Belt can or should be off-set by defining new areas of Green Belt. Indeed para. 142 deals with circumstances where Green Belt is to be lost and simply states that local authorities should:-

“set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land.”

52. It does not suggest that further Green Belt land should be defined. To do so in Tonbridge and Malling will simply constrain development further in the future (i.e. beyond the plan period) and will be such that the Green Belt boundaries would not endure for the long term as required by the NPPF. This is recognised by the draft plan under ‘risks.’

53. Option 2 Anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy : there is no national policy basis for such a policy. The Council has in the current development plan a strategic gap policy (originally derived from the Kent Structure Plan) and this has been shown on appeal to be inconsistent with the NPPF. General policies which seek to protect the character and appearance of the countryside may be appropriate, but a specific strategic policy is not.

54. Option 3 No change – leave existing outer Green Belt boundary unaltered : this is the only sound option as it is the only option that is consistent with national policy and that would not prejudice the long term future planning of the Borough. .

Supports an anti-coalescence policy and is in line with protecting the green belt and the green fields between communities. Extending the green belt is another way of doing this but brings risk of losing green belt elsewhere to enable the extension.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

We need to extend the outer boundary of the GREEN BELT not encroach upon it.

We need to protect the greenfield sites.

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

Protect more greenfield

This protects high quality green belt and reduces the risk of communities merging, protecting the character of the area - with open fields and orchards between communities

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

**Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.**

**An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics.**

**I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.**

**Hadlow has a recent history of flooding – it is essential that flood plain (safe flooding area) capacity is maintained and that houses are not built on areas prone to flooding, or which may displace flooding to other areas not previously affected.**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

[Options 1 and 2 selected]

Protect more greenfield

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

[Options 1 and 2 selected] **Protect more greenfield**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Strategic Gaps' are an established policy that can easily be implemented. Changes to the long-established Metropolitan Green Belt are difficult to achieve as they require 'exceptional circumstances' to justify changes.

We should value the separation of our rural communities, not just in the northeast but in areas between Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green, Ightham and Wrotham.

The Government has taken positive steps this year to help achieve the objective of lowering carbon emissions from developments. On 15 June 2022, changes to the Building Regulations (conservation of fuel and power) came into effect which require the CO2 emissions from new homes to be around 30% lower than the previous standards. In addition, emissions from other new buildings, including offices and shops, are required to achieve a 27% reduction. These changes are part of the Government's Road map to deliver the Future Homes and Buildings Standards by 2025. The Future Homes Standard will ensure that the average home from 2025 onwards will produce at least 75% lower CO2 emissions than one built to the Building Regulations, pre-June 2022 changes.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Extending the boundary will lead to an undesirable reduction in green belt land area elsewhere in the borough.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect



---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Supportive of option one to extend the outer boundary of the green belt to preserve the distinction of the three separate communities. West Malling, E Malling and kings hill

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

There will be no countryside left at the current rate of development.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

Q42/43 : I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

**An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the local development framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.**

**I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off areas, created as a result of new developments affecting already flood risk areas and new flood risk areas.**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)



---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

GREED

Total Desecration!!

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I wish to register my preference for the extension of the Green Belt.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)



---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Object to all on the basis of these two key points [Q2 & Q42/43]

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Option 2 seems to be including option 1.

Prevents merging of settlements with safeguarding the Green Belt.

---

**User Response: Text**

- This option protects more greenfield.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Its madness 6000 more homes, Kings Hill is sprawling enough – no infrastructure

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I do not support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Watlingbury Road, East Malling between the built-up areas of West Malling and East Malling.

This would:

- Prevent the merging of the local villages and Kings Hill
- Protect the open rural landscape, and
- Safeguard the settling of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Lack of resources. GP cannot cope as it is. No secondary school and buses are awful

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

Failure to do this will result in the loss of high-grade farmland, will harm many heritage assets including listed buildings, conservation areas and landscape features.

It will result in the merging of the three villages and nearby Hamlets.

---

**User Response: Text**

It will cause harm to the aquifer and shows a lack of consideration of hydrogeology issues.

It will cause harm to quiet lanes and rural road network. It will cause critical stress on existing road, medical and other infrastructure.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

We are also experiencing more and more flooding in the area which we don't seem to be doing anything about

The roads, doctors can't cope with what we have now let alone more houses with no parking. Also there are so many primary schools but no local secondary schools. Buses are terrible

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual

---

**User Response: Text**

character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

- **Option 1** is supported as the TMBC's Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances.
- **Option 1** is supported as it appears to provide the most robust protection for the area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.
- We support extending the Green Belt eastwards from West Malling town to a new boundary at Wateringbury Road, East Malling. as envisaged in the last, abandoned Local Plan which would:

o Provide strong protection for local green spaces, countryside and farmland

o Preserve the setting of the many heritage features

o Prevent coalescence of local individual settlements, including the local hamlets

- Should TMBC's rationale for "Exceptional Circumstances" allowing the redrawing of Green Belt boundaries be rebutted then Option 2 Anti-coalescence/ strategic gap policy may be a reasonable alternative policy option which could provide similar safeguards to Option 1
- Option 3 would give no additional protection and is not supported
- A comparison of Options 1 and 2 would have been useful for consultees to understand the differences between them
- The new Local Plan must provide new protection to the Carnation Green Space and local areas
- Table 4.4 of Chapter 4 of the Interim SA report lists potential merits of different options to prevent the merging of settlements but there is no account of interruption or degradation of water features such as the springs which could result from development of the area.
- TMBC is in possession of a full hydrogeology report by GWP of the area clearly showing a primary aquifer running through the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation area which:

o Any new development would damage

o Is significant to the success of Broadwater Farm in its fruit growing

o Is a vital supply of water to Ditton Stream which Well Street

o Flood mitigation would be required if any building were to be anticipated.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I do not support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the 4 general line of Waterringbury Road, East Malling between the built-up areas of West Malling and East Malling.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)



---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect the individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

The Stage 2 Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances so Option 1 is supported as it appears to provide the most robust protection for the Broadwater area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.

BAG would select Option 1 to extend to the outer edge of the Green Belt eastwards from West Malling town to a new boundary at Wateringbury Road, East Malling, as envisaged in the last, abandoned local Plan. This would provide strong protection for local countryside and farmland, it would preserve the setting of the many heritage features of this area of the Borough and also ensure that individual settlements, including the local hamlets, would not coalesce.

The consultation document suggests Option 2, an Anti-coalescence/ strategic gap policy as a reasonable alternative policy option which could provide similar safeguards as Option 1. BAG recognises that this option is given as the judgement of whether Exceptional Circumstances do exist to allow Option 1 to be implementable would be determined by a Planning Inspector, not TMBC itself. Option 3 would give no additional protection.

However, it is felt that a comparison of Options 1 and 2 would have been useful for consultees to understand the differences between them. BAG wishes to actively support appropriate measures which would safeguard its geographical area of interest but cannot determine whether Option 2 would include protection for sites such as Broadwater Farm and land extending to the A20 at "40 Acre Field" and Winterfield Farm. Any anti-coalescence policy must allow for the inclusion of these areas.

Further to BAG's belief that the local Plan must provide new protection to the Broadwater area, it is noted that in the Interim SA report in chapter 4 regarding measures to prevent the merging of settlements table 4.4 indicates there is no account of interruption or degradation of water features which could result from development of the area. This is despite the fact that TMBC is in possession of a full hydrogeology report (submitted as part of BAG's objection response to the Berkeley application for Broadwater Farm) that clearly shows that a primary aquifer supported by the known Folkestone Formation running through the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation area would be damaged by any development that excavates more than a couple of metres in a strip covering the width of the Conservation Area. This watercourse is significant to the success of Broadwater Farm in its fruit growing endeavours and is vital to the supply of water to the source of what is confusingly known as the Ditton Stream that rises at Well Street. It is also situated at such a high level that flood mitigation would be required if any building were to be anticipated. This report by GWP is available and should be referred to.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

To stop urban sprawl & communities merging into one, so communities retain their unique identify.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Further expansion in the North East of the borough could lead to an urban sprawl with no identify or demarcation between communities.

As already stated, the Green Belt should extent to the West Malling by-pass. But we also do not want all existing and new development to ??, creating urban sprawl and destroying the character of this area.

Need to maintain existing green areas and avoid a big urban area with no green spaces.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

Green Belt boundaries define urban and rural limits.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.**

**An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.**

**I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.**

Prefer options 1 or 2.

Protect more greenfield.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

Stops villages and towns merging and is in line with protecting the greenbelt and greenfields between communities.

Prefer options 1 or 2.

Protect more greenfield.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect**

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Options 1 and 3 above selected:

I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road, East Malling between the built up areas of West Malling and East Malling.

This would:

- Prevent the merging of the local villages and Kings Hill
- Protect the open rural landscape, and
- Safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I register support for Option 1 to extend the Greenbelt.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect



---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

- **Option 1** is supported as the TMBC's Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances.
- **Option 1** is supported as it appears to provide the most robust protection for the area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.
- We support extending the Green Belt eastwards from West Malling town to a new boundary at Wateringbury Road, East Malling. as envisaged in the last, abandoned Local Plan which would:
  - Provide strong protection for local green spaces, countryside and farmland
  - Preserve the setting of the many heritage features
  - Prevent coalescence of local individual settlements, including the local hamlets
- Should TMBC's rationale for "Exceptional Circumstances" allowing the redrawing of Green Belt boundaries be rebutted then Option 2 Anti-coalescence/ strategic gap policy may be a reasonable alternative policy option which could provide similar safeguards to Option 1
- Option 3 would give no additional protection and is not supported
- A comparison of Options 1 and 2 would have been useful for consultees to understand the differences between them
- The new Local Plan must provide new protection to the Carnation Green Space and local areas
- Table 4.4 of Chapter 4 of the Interim SA report lists potential merits of different options to prevent the merging of settlements but there is no account of interruption or degradation of water features such as the springs which could result from development of the area.
- TMBC is in possession of a full hydrogeology report by GWP of the area clearly showing a primary aquifer running through the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation area which:
  - Any new development would damage
  - Is significant to the success of Broadwater Farm in its fruit growing
  - Is a vital supply of water to Ditton Stream which Well Street
  - Flood mitigation would be required if any building were to be anticipated.

---

**User Response: Text**

It protects villages and towns merging and protects green belt and fields between villages and communities.

Greenfield land must be protected

For the sake of people, and the planet, we need to extend the outer boundary of the Green Belt, and not encroach upon it.

We need to protect the Greenfield sites.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Extending the boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land areas elsewhere in the borough.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road, East Malling between the built-up areas of West Malling and East Malling. This would:

- Prevent the merging of the local villages and Kings Hill
- Protect the open rural landscape, and
- Safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Option 2, which is a form of option 1 because it IS an extension of the green belt and should be regarded as such.  
Option 2 is preferable to prevent settlements coalescing.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

- **Option 1** is supported as the TMBC's Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances.
- **Option 1** is supported as it appears to provide the most robust protection for the area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.
- We support extending the Green Belt eastwards from West Malling town to a new boundary at Wateringbury Road, East Malling. as envisaged in the last, abandoned Local Plan which would:

o Provide strong protection for local green spaces, countryside and farmland

o Preserve the setting of the many heritage features

o Prevent coalescence of local individual settlements, including the local hamlets

- Should TMBC's rationale for "Exceptional Circumstances" allowing the redrawing of Green Belt boundaries be rebutted then Option 2 Anti-coalescence/ strategic gap policy may be a reasonable alternative policy option which could provide similar safeguards to Option 1
- Option 3 would give no additional protection and is not supported
- A comparison of Options 1 and 2 would have been useful for consultees to understand the differences between them
- The new Local Plan must provide new protection to the Carnation Green Space and local areas
- Table 4.4 of Chapter 4 of the Interim SA report lists potential merits of different options to prevent the merging of settlements but there is no account of interruption or degradation of water features such as the springs which could result from development of the area.
- TMBC is in possession of a full hydrogeology report by GWP of the area clearly showing a primary aquafer running through the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation area which:

o Any new development would damage

o Is significant to the success of Broadwater Farm in its fruit growing

o Is a vital supply of water to Ditton Stream which Well Street

o Flood mitigation would be required if any building were to be anticipated.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect



---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

For the sake of people, and the planet, we need to extend the outer boundary of the Green Belt, and not encroach upon it.

We need to protect the Greenfield sites

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I do not support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Waterbury Road, East Malling between the built up areas of West Malling and East Malling. This would

- Prevent the merging of the local villages and Kings Hill
- Protect the open rural landscape, and
- safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Selected Option 2 and Option 3

**Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.**

**An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these**

---

**User Response: Text**

**characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.**

**I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.**

retain the existing **Boundary** as an immovable object to protect green space and add an **anti-coalescence /strategic gap policy** to maintain the character of the borough.

Supports an anti-coalescence policy (stops villages and towns from merging) and is in line with protecting the green belt and the green fields between communities. Extending the green belt is another way of doing this but brings a risk of losing the green belt elsewhere to enable the extension

Option 2 - Anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy.

Please see the two maps below for Wateringbury and East Malling respectively, with the base maps courtesy Google Earth.

We have noted that T&M's Call for Sites elicited many candidates around Wateringbury and East Malling. The yellow outlines are the candidate sites and many of them are on good-quality agricultural land.

Wateringbury is about three-quarters of a mile to the west of Teston and East Malling is about 2.5 miles to the north of Teston. There is a network of minor roads linking these three villages, facilitating travel between the A20 and A26.

The first map also shows the proximity of Kings Hill, another major target for potential development.

Rush-hour traffic volumes through Teston are very substantial, as evidenced by professional traffic surveys. The very narrow Malling Road through Teston, which is on a steep gradient and has no pavements, has about 1,500 vehicles each day, in each direction, with 70-75% exceeding the 30mph speed restriction

6  
on entering or leaving the village.  
East Malling High Street, within its conservation area, is severely blighted during rush-hours and the Wateringbury traffic lights have a very troubling air quality record.  
All three villages are also continually threatened by developers seeking to open up access from Kings Hill on to Wateringbury Road, which would exacerbate the above problems.

While candidate sites need to go through sustainability appraisal and therefore some of the candidate sites will fall away, if T&M selects several of those depicted in the maps above, it would thwart any wish to avoid coalescence and would confirm a perhaps cynical view that sites are being preferentially selected near the Borough's eastern boundary, without any consideration for the traffic implications.

Whilst we believe it is important to prevent the coalescence of nearby settlements, we have reservations about extending the outer Green Belt boundary; given that the Council is considering releasing Green Belt land elsewhere to meet the claimed development needs (intimated in Q.40). Therefore, it is likely that Option 1 would put more pressure to release other Green Belt land in the Borough, with the harm from this undesirable reduction elsewhere outweighing the option benefit.

---

**User Response: Text**

We would only support the extension of the outer Green Belt boundary, if the existing buffers between other settlements within the Green Belt were preserved. For instance, as noted above (in Q.2 & 11), there are number of potential Green Belt sites (e.g. 59764 & 59641) in south-west Tonbridge that are being considered for development. However, the Green Belt around southwest Tonbridge already performs a vital role in preventing such coalescence and providing a buffer between the existing town confines and the separate hamlet of Lower Haysden. It cannot be right to extend the outer Green Belt boundary, if other development sites are taken forward that could reduce this vital buffer to only c.200m separation between Tonbridge and Lower Haysden, which is less than the effective absolute minimum buffer of 500m (that TMBC previously set-out1).

**Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.**

**An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.**

**I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.**

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

Option 1 and 2 selected

**Protect more greenfield**

---

## User Response: Text

Extending this boundary will probably lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough.

- **Option 1** is supported as the TMBC's Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances.
- **Option 1** is supported as it appears to provide the most robust protection for the area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.
- We support extending the Green Belt eastwards from West Malling town to a new boundary at Wateringbury Road, East Malling. as envisaged in the last, abandoned Local Plan which would:

o Provide strong protection for local green spaces, countryside and farmland

o Preserve the setting of the many heritage features

o Prevent coalescence of local individual settlements, including the local hamlets

- Should TMBC's rationale for "Exceptional Circumstances" allowing the redrawing of Green Belt boundaries be rebutted then Option 2 Anti-coalescence/ strategic gap policy may be a reasonable alternative policy option which could provide similar safeguards to Option 1
- Option 3 would give no additional protection and is not supported
- A comparison of Options 1 and 2 would have been useful for consultees to understand the differences between them
- The new Local Plan must provide new protection to the Carnation Green Space and local areas
- Table 4.4 of Chapter 4 of the Interim SA report lists potential merits of different options to prevent the merging of settlements but there is no account of interruption or degradation of water features such as the springs which could result from development of the area.
- TMBC is in possession of a full hydrogeology report by GWP of the area clearly showing a primary aquifer running through the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation area which:

o Any new development would damage

o Is significant to the success of Broadwater Farm in its fruit growing

o Is a vital supply of water to Ditton Stream which Well Street

o Flood mitigation would be required if any building were to be anticipated.

Area already over-developed around Kings Hill.

retain the existing **Boundary** as an immovable object to protect green space and add an **anti-coalescence /strategic gap policy** to maintain the character of the borough.

Existing green belt objectives are and have been relevant to areas immediately beyond the current boundaries

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

This would prevent the merging of the local villages and Kings Hill. It would also protect the open landscape and safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)



---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

In a time of climate emergency this is the councils opportunity to be a lead in sustainable environmental policies and not a chance to cash in to seem progressive on stats.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**[ x ] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

**[ x ] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).**

**[ x ] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).**

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1).

This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces.

Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

I trust these objections are fully considered and that the green space s of Kings Hill and surrounding areas are kept for the good of the community

**[ x ] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).**

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1).

This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces.

Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

I trust these objections are fully considered and that the green space s of Kings Hill and surrounding areas are kept for the good of the community

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**The above plans would pose serious danger to farmlands and woodlands critical to the wellbeing of local residents, harmful to local wildlife and providing important CO2 stores required to mitigate against global warming.**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, , East Malling and West Malling (option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. I am supportive of (Option 5) for an entirely new development is created somewhere in the borough.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

The above plans would pose serious danger to farmlands and woodlands critical to the wellbeing of local residents, harmful to local wildlife and providing important CO2 stores required to mitigated against global warming.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Protect more greenfield

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings

---

**User Response: Text**

Hill, East Malling and West Malling (**Option 1**). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Option 1 yes

option 2 yes

Protect more greenfield

Extending the boundary will lead to an undesirable reduction in Green Belt land area elsewhere in the Borough

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

**Protect more greenfield**

**Option 1 & 2 - Protect more greenfield**

It protects villages and towns merging and protects green belt and fields between villages and communities.

Supports and anti-coalescence policy (stops villages and towns from merging) and is in line with protecting the green belt and the green fields between communities. Extending the green belt is another way of doing this but brings a risk of losing the green belt elsewhere to enable the extension.

---

**User Response: Text**

Options 1 & 2 - protect more green belt, brownfield and urban sites should be the first option for developments.

I register my support for “Option 1” to extend the Green Belt in order to protect the countryside and high grade agricultural land.

In the time that I have lived in the Borough, I have become more upset about the erosion of our green spaces and the seemingly wilful ignoring of very pertinent objections made by local residents to planning applications (for example, the Forty Acres site) which, with one sweep of a Planning Inspector’s pen, was nodded through. One reason given was, the lack of a local plan and the need to provide new homes overriding public concerns.

The talk in the plan of improving infrastructure and access to public transport appear good on the surface. However, we are seeing increases of cars on roads that simply cannot cope with more. Just try and get through the High Street and Mill Street in East Malling in rush hour to experience what it is like to live in a “rural community” in the Borough these days., and with another development being proposed at the end of the High Street. In the meantime, Kent County Council are proposing to withdraw funding for the one bus that serves East Malling, threatening those that rely on a bus with the possibility of having no bus service. These things never appear joined up in any way and are a constant worry for working mothers, the elderly and other residents.

- Protect more greenfield

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)



---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

[Option 1 & 2] protect more greenfield

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

[Options 1 and 2] Protect more greenfield

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**Stop the villages merging into one urban mass**

**Option 1 & 2 Protect more greenfield**

We need to extend the outer boundary of the GREEN BELT not encroach upon it.

We need to protect the greenfield sites.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Green Belts were created to give separation between communities and they must remain as such with no building encroaching.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

Options 2 and 3

Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

Options 2 and 3

Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.

An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.

I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1). I moved to Kings Hill eleven years ago to have a family. My husband and I felt the development was prestigious due to being reasonably small, felt like a community, was surrounded by green belt and a great place to have children as it had the feeling of being safe. Over the years, we have watched the area expand and the prestigious feeling is dwindling away. In the eleven years, it has begun to feel very over crowded. We are lucky to live on the original phase one however even this will be under threat with the above proposals. Such a shame. We do not want TMBC to build on any green belt no matter where it is. Please consider using derelict land or building on land where dwellings can be knocked down and rebuilt.. we do not need any more developments on our Borough. We are truly ruining the beautiful English countryside and I am feeling sad for our children. Soon there will be no green spaces.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Protect greenbelt and retain the character of the borough

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Option 1 & 2

Protect more greenfield

option 1 and option 2

Protect more greenfield

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I also support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect the individual character of the settlements and important green spaces.

---

**User Response: Text**

I also support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect the individual character of the settlements and important green spaces.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Supports and anti-coalescence policy (stops villages and towns merging) and is in line with protecting the green belt and the green fields between communities. Extending the green belt is another way of doing this but brings risk of losing green belt elsewhere to enable the extension.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I would not like to see the boundary changed, then connecting of settlements to occur.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of



---

**User Response: Text**

local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

SUPPORT Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling & West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces.

Firstly, I believe there should be an extension to the Green Belt Boundary to the general line of Watlington Rd, E.Malling between the built-up areas of West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill. This will prevent the coalescence of the villages and protect the rural landscape.

We feel that option 1 should be adopted because Tonbridge and Malling district is largely greenbelt with areas of outstanding natural beauty which does not leave sufficient room outside of these areas for the amount of housing requested.

The built up areas already have infrastructure in place and the countryside does not. Also, built up areas could more easily be adapted to accommodate increased traffic whereby country lanes cannot.

We would not like to see more and more housing, in our rural villages where there is no definition between the countryside and urban areas which could all link together and destroy our rural heritage and rural way of living.

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I wish to register my preference for the extension of the Green Belt.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

We also support extending the Green Belt eastwards to Watlingbury Road to protect the countryside between

---

**User Response: Text**

East Malling, West Malling, Leybourne and Kings Hill and to maintain separation between these communities.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

This would prevent the merging of the local villages and Kings Hill. It would also protect the open landscape and safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I also want to add my support for extending the Green Belt boundary from West Malling through to Wateringbury Road, East Malling.

This is land that is valuable for our heritage and health and well-being as well as for the biodiversity it supports. We need local plans to protect our precious natural assets before it is too late.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

In addition local infrastructure cannot support the current development, let alone more!

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1) Insufficient bus and GP services to meet demand

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I have had a look at the plans to build even more houses at Kings Hill. We moved here in 2006 and one of the reasons was that Kings Hill was a new garden village with plenty of green space around it, it had a medical centre in the centre along with an array of shops for everyday needs, a bus service that could take one to Tunbridge Wells and Maidstone and a railway station not too far away.

Over the years the bus services have been cut and now there is a very limited buses with restricted hours and extremely limited service over the weekends. I understand that the X1 and X2 are going to be cut out altogether



---

**User Response: Text**

from February next year. The railway station now only connects to Victoria where a while back one could travel to London Bridge.

How can the council classify Kings Hill as an urban settlement when we do not have the facilities at the moment to support that status let alone once all this building has been completed. I think we need to be classified as a village. I support the green belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling which would then protect the individual character of the villages and therefore protect the green spaces. By protecting the green belt, it would allow for the planting of more trees.

As far as the medical centre is in Kings Hill it cannot serve the existing community, there used to be the surgery in West Malling but that has closed. The hospitals at the moment cannot cope with sick people at the moment -Have you heard about the waiting lists I!! It's okay to say that we will build a new medical facility but who is going to staff it, there are not enough doctors and nurses at the moment. They could not staff the medical facility at Leybourne Chase!

If you do not have a decent bus service, the alternative is to drive but not everyone can do that. thought the idea of providing good public transport was to cut pollution and also to control the amount of traffic holdups. I would not cycle on our roads out of Kings Hill as they are so dangerous with huge lorries thundering past, but I do cycle around Kings Hill village.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**[ x ] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect**

---

**User Response: Text**

individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the extension of the green belt boundary to the general line of Watringbury Road, East Malling between the built up area of West Malling and East Malling.

This would incorporate a beautiful area of Kent countryside which is currently used for recreational purposes by local residents and is home to many species of birds.

It would protect the open rural landscape, prevent the merging of local villages and Kings Hill, and safeguard the setting of the historic town of West Malling and village of East Malling, together with their conservation areas and those of New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

Protect against agricultural land.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I would support the extension of the green belt boundary to the general line of Waterinbury Road.

As i fear the development at Broadwater Farm will eventually be approved this would provide some protection from developers seeking to build on any farmland and greenfield sites around East Malling and would stop the area ending up like Milton Keynes.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

retain the existing **Boundary** as an immovable object to protect green space and add an **anti-coalescence /strategic gap policy** to maintain the character of the borough.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)



---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

---

## User Response: Text

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

Option 1 is supported.

The Stage 2 Green Belt Study supports the case for exceptional circumstances so Option 1 is supported as it appears to provide the most robust protection for the Broadwater area as well as providing a clear rationale for the measured release of Green Belt land in the Sevenoaks and Tonbridge Housing Market Area.

BAG would select Option 1 to extend to the outer edge of the Green Belt eastwards from West Malling town to a new boundary at Watringbury Road, East Malling, as envisaged in the last, abandoned Local Plan. This would provide strong protection for local countryside and farmland, it would preserve the setting of the many heritage features of this area of the Borough and also ensure that individual settlements, including the local hamlets, would not coalesce.

The consultation document suggests Option 2, an Anti-coalescence/ strategic gap policy as a reasonable alternative policy option which could provide similar safeguards as Option 1. BAG recognises that this option is given as the judgement of whether Exceptional Circumstances do exist to allow Option 1 to be implementable would be determined by a Planning Inspector, not TMBC itself. Option 3 would give no additional protection.

However, it is felt that a comparison of Options 1 and 2 would have been useful for consultees to understand the differences between them. BAG wishes to actively support appropriate measures which would safeguard its geographical area of interest but cannot determine whether Option 2 would include protection for sites such as Broadwater Farm and land extending to the A20 at "40 Acre Field" and Winterfield Farm. Any anti-coalescence policy must allow for the inclusion of these areas.

Further to BAG's belief that the Local Plan must provide new protection to the Broadwater area, it is noted that in the Interim SA report in chapter 4 regarding measures to prevent the merging of settlements table 4.4 indicates there is no account of interruption or degradation of water features which could result from development of the area. This is despite the fact that TMBC is in possession of a full hydrogeology report (submitted as part of BAG's objection response to the Berkeley application for Broadwater Farm) that clearly shows that a primary

---

**User Response: Text**

aquafer supported by the known Folkestone Formation running through the New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation area would be damaged by any development that excavates more than a couple of metres in a strip covering the width of the Conservation Area. This watercourse is significant to the success of Broadwater Farm in its fruit growing endeavours and is vital to the supply of water to the source of what is confusingly known as the Ditton Stream that rises at Well Street. It is also situated at such a high level that flood mitigation would be required if any building were to be anticipated. This report by GWP is available and should be referred to.

**An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.**

**I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.**

Extending some areas of green belt could lead to loss of green belt in other areas & be used by developers to build in these areas.

I SUPPORT THE GREEN BELT BEING EXTENDED AROUND KINGS HILL, EAST MALLING AND WEST MALLING TO PROTECT THE INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER OF THE SETTLEMENTS AND IMPORTANT GREEN SPACES.

I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury East Malling between the built up areas of West Malling and East Malling.

This would -

- prevent the merging of local villages and Kings Hill,
- protect the open rural landscape, and
- safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling, and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

Once green belt areas are used for building there'll be none left they will all go so keep them.

**[ x] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).**

Option 4 review the parish boundary of kings hill publicly. Prevent the merging of local villages and kings hill/

---

**User Response: Text**

already prevented protect the open rural landscape an only controlled anyway by politicians now Indians are protection of the historical Royal Air Force site.

I do not support the extension of the Green Belt Boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road, East malling between the built-up areas of West Malling and East Malling. This would;

- Prevent the merging of the Local Villages and kings Hill
- Protect the open rural landscape, and
- Safeguard the setting of the historic towns of West and East Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of

---

**User Response: Text**

significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

---

**User Response: Text**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

---

**User Response: Text**

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1). Kings Hill is a beautiful garden village which will be destroyed by these multiple proposals to fill every piece of green landscape with housing. There will be nowhere to walk in nature and the only option for exercise will be to pound the pavements with or without dogs

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1). And the Wildlife

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all.

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

---

**User Response: Text**

Option 2. Options should protect village communities.

Option 2 Supports Anti-coalescence which stops villages and towns merging & is inline with protecting green fields & Green Belt between communities.

Answer: 'Strategic Gaps' are an established policy that can easily be implemented. Changes to the long established Metropolitan Green Belt are difficult to achieve as they require 'exceptional circumstances' to justify changes.

We should value the separation of our rural communities, not just in the north east but in areas between Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green, Ightham and Wrotham.

**Option 3. No change, leave existing green belt boundary unaltered.**

**An anti coalescence policy is considered vital in existing areas of green belt that already hold these characteristics. In particular the Local Development Framework (para 6.3.35) stated East Peckham, Snoll Hatch and Hale Street must be kept separate and not filled in by housing. There is therefore previous established policy to support the ongoing and continued protection for an anti coalescence policy, being strictly maintained in respect of these areas.**

**I am concerned about the further risk of additional flooding and run off, created as a result of new development affecting areas previously not impacted by flooding.**

N/A

I support the concept of the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill to prevent the amalgamation of Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling (Option 1). This would protect in the individual character of the settlements and protect important green spaces. Option 2 of a limited extension of the Green Belt would also be preferable to Option 3 which would provide no protection at all. Without the Green Belt extension, there is a serious danger of significant destruction of green spaces, farmland and woodlands. These areas are critical for the wellbeing of local residents and as providing important CO2 stores required to help mitigate against global warming. Without the Green Belt extension, we will also risk the destruction of the historic hamlets of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)**



---

**User Response: Text**

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

**I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling** to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1)

- This option protects more greenfield land.

I support the Green belt being extended around Kings Hill, East quinn & West Malling to protect the individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (OPTION 1)

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:15:37. Total records: 1473

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 48] What are your reasons for selecting these particular...

### User Response: Text

Getting the habitat and tree coverage right will have the best long term outcome for biodiversity and humans.

Reduction in carbon footprint, reduction in cost and benefits to our ecosystem.

Reduction in energy demand is desirable through insulation and other energy efficiencies in new builds.

We need to protect wildlife by maintaining suitable habitats.

Trees provide much needed shade in heat waves, reduce water run-off and help absorb pollution and noise. They are a natural habitat for animals, birds and insects and the colour green is mood enhancing.

Encourage biodiversity and retain leafy green space

All are important. Preventing loss of habitat and improving habitat connectivity are essential.

I don't know why solar panels with batteries aren't a requirement for new buildings. They certainly should be. And ground source heat pumps to supply a few adjacent buildings and/or air source heat pumps as standard. They shouldn't be putting in new gas boilers right up until the day they're made illegal!

They are all equally important. Very difficult to select any 3 particular ones

Habitat creation is key to supporting species at risk (i.e red listed Swifts) and allowing species the space to adapt

I'd like to have chosen more - they seemed to be the most urgent.

Ideally, improve the environment without building all these houses in this region. But if you have to, then at least make them as environmentally friendly as possible.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (solar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc. either individual or communal) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction, also reduces both air pollution and noise and provides a cooler, shadier environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Important for wildlife

climate change should not be a policy

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings Habitat creation – built fabric (eg swift bricks) Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows) Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) Multi-functional green infrastructure (recreation, carbon sinks and biodiversity net gain) Passive design (orientation, layout, landscaping) Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (eg green roofs, water butts, retention ponds) Tree coverage - increased Other – please state below adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

We are devastating our own area - this is short sighted, we need to take more environmental actions not destroy more habitats for wildlife.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Every opportunity should be taken to reduce the production of greenhouse gasses.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all

---

**User Response: Text**

their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

They are being eroded fast

All will contribute to climate disaster avoidance - quite important really.

We all need energy, it must be delivered in the most environmentally beneficial way

If you build an environmentally future proof house it should come with energy generation and water heating via other means ie photovoltaics, ground pumps etc  
If you build sustainable drainage then you have to have the gardens to collect and space for the retention pond therefore you create new habitats for nature

The above are all equally important, but I believe the ones I have selected would help to cover some of the others as well.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

All 10 of the measures listed are important and cannot be assessed in isolation.

Beautiful green spaces where you can walk to what you need is what creates a pleasant community, connected to itself and to others.

Climate change and environment

Because they have the potential to save money as well as helping to protect the environment.

Because climate change is piffle, so don't waste money on it...

Really they are all important it was hard to choose

I know from personal experience with photovoltaics that there are huge gains to be made both for individual householders and for society in good planning to increase energy production in the home and to reduce its waste there. With solar and ground source heat pumps much depends on location, layout and orientation. This work is far better done at the time of construction rather than as a retro fit.

---

**User Response: Text**

I would like to see many of these options used to help the environment and make TMB a better area to live in. During Covid many people improved their wellbeing by being closer to nature.

They are all important. If the Sustainability Assessment is taken seriously then there should be a further discussion of what more is needed to redress the damage to nature. I picked the things I thought would embrace most environmental challenges. If only the government hadn't dragged its heels on passive housing, we wouldn't be in such trouble over energy now.

I would rather TMBC said to the government we are not going to meet your plans we are not going to allow developers to build in our borough but we will invest in solar farms, wind turbines and renewable energy farms. If we lose any space let it be for a positive future not to make a developer rich.

Car journeys will be the major driver of climate change arising from the proposed new developments. Other factors such as the energy expended in construction of developments are small by comparison.

Make any new developments as environmentally friendly as possible.

These are the most important climate change and biodiversity imperatives.

support future developments also

Heat efficiency is important, and we all know that more trees are required to assist with carbon neutralisation.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

---

**User Response: Text**

**We would like ourselves and our grandchildren to lead healthier, longer lives.**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

If climate change is to be halted, anything councils can do, however small, can only be good. Sustainable planning of housing development is a way councils can contribute towards this.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Work with nature, not against it. The climate change data appears to suggest that we are require too.

I believe that the best way to tackle climate change is to reduce the demand for fossil fuels such as oil and gas. The three options I have chosen would best do this

Planning sites that don't further impact bio diversity/green space in the 1st place. Offset just isn't acceptable compensation for trees chopped down and wildlife losing their habitat. When we do build new homes they should be energy efficient and support reuse.

---

**User Response: Text**

Ideally as least intrusive as possible

I think it is very important to try and reduce car usage, so increasing the options for walking and cycling can only be a good thing, and have a beneficial health benefit, as long as the air quality is good. Renewable energy and energy efficient homes will not only help the environment but also reduce costs for families and businesses.

All of the above climate change initiatives have a place to play in development, however the three identified are likely to have the greatest impact. Habitat protection is equally important, where it has been identified that natural habitats for a particular species are being changed or altered.  
Green and blue infrastructure has a crucial role in master planning for new development through landscape strategy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

It is impossible to base my answer on a selection of 3 options. At least 7 options here are of equal importance.

see above

Habitat creation supports wild life and biodiversity

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run off from fields and inadequate drains

I see these as the priorities.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.



---

**User Response: Text**

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation supports wild life and biodiversity

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run off from fields and inadequate drains

We must get away from dependency on fossil fuels.

Encourage the use of public transport and reduce dependency on the use of motor vehicles.

Nature and habitat must be protected.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Solar panels in fields reduces open countryside for flora and fauna.

Cost of living rises will be slightly offset with the above measures

Eco friendly construction methods are important as well as insulated homes to reduce energy usage and reduce our dependency on heating.

It's so important to use solar panels for clean, green energy rather than relying on fossil fuels. We've seen the increase in energy prices in recent months so it's a complete no brainer to invest in renewables.

Need to be aware of the dangers of climate change .

Passive design with multi-function green infrastructure would seem to be the most efficient use of the resources, with MMC assisting in carbon capture.

---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Solar panels in fields reduces open countryside for flora and fauna.

To protect the environment

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat

Will only benefit if all local authorities mirrored same policies, but of course, in the grand scheme of things, lost. The UK is only a tiny proportion of world climate degradation, but as long as 'we' are addressing with a passion, we are doing what we can.

all are important, but most important is reducing CO2e emissions

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains

---

**User Response: Text**

We need to move away from carbon energy sources and minimise power usage

There is a huge opportunity to increase active travel locally which would bring enormous air quality, traffic reduction, health and wellbeing benefits, along with long-term savings to the health service in particular.

Solar panels and battery storage should be mandatory on all new housing and will help address concerns around energy shortages, pollution, dependency on foreign supplies, and contribute towards lower cost solutions.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

I like to keep the countryside as it was intended for people to enjoy and not build houses on.

As stated

Supporting wildlife and diversity. My own garden has seen a dramatic decrease in the breadth of garden birds to the destruction of habitat and use of pesticides.

Tree cover assist in carbon reduction

agricultural land supports self sufficient food supply and assist in preventing flooding in areas already affected by climate change and seasonal weather.

To reduce dependence on gas and oil

To preserve air quality

To preserve wildlife

Protecting natural work and environment

**We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing**

---

**User Response: Text**

**legislation, we are kiling our habitat**

How should development be managed? Viability

When considering the various requirements that could be introduced, we have to be mindful of the impact on viability, and therefore deliverability, of development. If the economic cost is too high the development is likely to be unviable, which means that no homes would be provided. That is an outcome that must be avoided if we are to positively address our assessed development needs. While the recent changes to the Building Regulations will make a positive contribution to mitigating impacts on climate change, there will be an economic cost of achieving them.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

All but one on the list are very important to the environment and for future development for the health our planet

Supporting biodiversity

Biodiversity, open spaces and trees are important for our wildlife and human well-being but also so imporant to our enviroment.

Environment

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

---

**User Response: Text**

They would have the greatest impact on our communities in terms of the environment, air quality, energy self sustainability and hopefully with green corridors, also biodiversity.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Nature can heal itself given the opportunity.

All measures are important to address climate change and meet our targets

It is clear that successive governments have not invested properly in energy production (leaving the UK at the mercy of geopolitical events), as a result, pressure can be taken off of the network if houses produce a degree of their own energy. This may also make through life costs cheaper for the occupants.

Natural habitat is important for the environment and improving individual well-being. It also makes a place a more desirable place to live and thus is a win all round!

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings

adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs

Lots of small habitat, wildlife and energy efficiency makes large differences

Natural habitat creation

Increasing tree cover

Minimise flooding

I see these as essential to secure the future of our planet.

---

**User Response: Text**

Maintaining existing habitats is critical. The continuous loss of trees and hedgerows is impacting directly on biodiversity and sustainability. The loss of the best and most versatile farming land is directly in opposition to climate change considerations.

Building on brownfield sites, even where these are in green belt, should be the priority

The calculations for biodiversity need to be reviewed, it is unfathomable how building 1000 houses on an orchard could result in an increase in biodiversity where existing wild flowers, occasional trees and varied fungi are a widespread feature of the existing environment. The impact on mammals of such development on these, such as rabbits, foxes, deer, badgers etc, is very significant, and the loss of nature corridors also needs to be considered; having small areas of ancient woodland surrounded by housing does not work!

Disagree with being limited to only three choices.

Maintaining existing habitats is critical. The continuous loss of trees and hedgerows is impacting directly on biodiversity and sustainability. The loss of the best and most versatile farming land is directly in opposition to climate change considerations.

Building on brownfield sites, even where these are in green belt, should be the priority.

Calculations for biodiversity need revisiting it is beyond ridiculous to suggest that building houses on an orchard could result in a biodiversity gain.

The best way to start improvements is to avoid actions which immediately have a detrimental impact.

As stated throughout I believe that the retention and creation of green spaces helps to promote improved physical and mental wellbeing.

All are equally important!!

Offset other negative climate and emissions impacts but also ensure a forward thinking responsible approach to development of both housing and the infrastructure of the town and borough.

Use carbon neutral methods to reduce emissions asap. Housing materials and construction should mitigate against climate change.

Active travel opporutnties - will provide more attractive healthy alternatives and better quality of life

Energ efficient, future proofed buildings - will help reduce energy costs and tackle climate change. This will have benefits for households given cost of living crisis.

Habitat creation - trees - will support biodiversity and help reduce emissions. will make it a more attractive environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.  
There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

development is required but we must prioritise getting the best out of our current investment in buildings  
energy generation should be prioritised locally.

If we must build, build as energy and resource efficient as possible within current technology.

Energy generation and saving is key, especially at the moment. The more energy we can generate from renewables the better we will be.

They are all important: you only let me choose three!

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.  
There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

The environment and the council should see this as a priority.

these are important to me

Energy efficient homes, able to retain heat and reduce consumption are paramount to our future.

Encourage wildlife  
Carbon reduction through tree planting  
Avoid seasonal flooding by farmland absorption and not overloading drains

---

**User Response: Text**

Encourage wildlife.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and helps in carbon reduction.

Farmland in flood plain absorbs flood waters.

To reduce energy costs and our carbon footprint.

Whilst all are important, the ones most beneficial to mitigating climate change are the 3 options chosen - energy efficient houses reduces reliance on fossil fuels, carbon reduction generally and waste through heat loss into the atmosphere (think of the temperature difference in London). Low carbon energy generation has a direct effect on mitigating climate change as does increasing tree coverage. Tree coverage has the added benefit of habitat creation

I think all of these things are important. I would like to see a local plan that ensures that any new development meets certain standards in terms of self-sustainability, and minimal impact on the natural environment.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation supports wildlife and biodiversity  
Tree cover increases biodiversity  
There has been localised flooding due to inadequate drainage and field run-off.

There are a number of nature-based responses to climate change, including wilding, tree and hedgerow establishment, permanent grassland creation and management and soil carbon enhancement for instance through regenerative farming, all of which would be coherent with the Kent Downs AONB landscape character and qualities and which increase resilience and reduce the impact. There is an important role for the AONB landscape in helping to achieve carbon sequestration and cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

However, in respect of decentralised renewable and/or low carbon energy generation, large scale wind generation and field scale solar arrays are likely to result in significant adverse impacts to the landscape and scenic beauty of the Kent Downs and where this is the case are not appropriate within the AONB. Smaller scale installations may be acceptable and solar panels are encouraged on the large span roofs of agricultural and industrial buildings.

Habitat is vital

TMBC has a policy of not decreasing the number of trees in and around the town.



---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Energy efficiency is clearly becoming a critical issue for the planet

As above, they are all important so choosing just 3 is wasn't a true reflection of my preferences but I have picked those that I think would have the least negative impact on a build.

These all link to improving our planet and limiting our impact on the local environment, plus making our villages/towns a nicer place to live.

Attempt to move to net zero

Important for the community to engage in measures that can relatively easily achieve themselves.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

see above.

all of these are important - this is really exciting element of the plan - my choices focus on building partly because the natural environment aspect is already pretty good here - one can do more on habitat but the these building-focused energy-focused aspects are essential

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

---

**User Response: Text**

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Preservation of our planet and the encouragement of diversity with our wildlife. Trees assist with combating CO2 and for cooling our world.

to reduce carbon foot print and demonstrate to our commitment to biodiversity

Trying in every aspect to preserve the general well being, appearance, and reduction in pollution/noise in the area.

see above

Reduce energy use, wellbeing of residents and wildlife, capture carbon dioxide, retain water for irrigation and reduce flooding risk.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

All important to address climate change and meet targets

All these measures are important though some obviously overlap.

I should like to see biodiversity increased in the borough, not just individual species count but species breadth,

---

**User Response: Text**

depth and population size improvements. Encourage habitats to be self sustaining with green corridors between sites and green spaces and attention paid to leaving untidy areas and unmown areas in recreational sites.

Habitat creation for wildlife

Tree cover assists in carbon reduction and increases biodiversity.

Localised flooding has occurred in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

See above.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Please see the box above. Other.

---

**User Response: Text**

If you are going to strip animals of their habitats, the very LEAST that should be done is providing for them in some fashion within new developments. Although, leaving the current natural areas alone would help with climate change, biodiversity, flooding etc. more than anything.

Overall combined climate and biodiversity imperatives

These enable homes to have less negative impact on climate change. As developments in general would be on what is currently green space then better to use less land and enable existing habitats to be enhanced rather than developing 'new' habitats on the fringes or within housing developments. (Only trying to reintroduce a little bit of what is being destroyed)

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

I was limited to three, but think that all are important and while it is hard to prioritise, I have had to.

Seem to be the most important, in my view.

No response

There are already potential risks to properties and areas of land specified in Hildenborough due to flooding.

Supporting wild life .

Tree covering to assist carbon reduction.

Past flooding in area due to inadequate drainage.

I think they speak for themselves, to enhance the environment and to reduce carbon emissions.

They are all important but those chosen to relate to previous comments

---

**User Response: Text**

All the above are important to me but the 3 identified should be encouraged by the local plan as many of the others are controlled by building regulations.

The greatest climate change benefit would be to limit new housing to sustainable locations and prevent new development on green sites. This is determined by the adopted housing strategy and selection of sites to be adopted.

I have taken access to transport hubs to be a key issue but do not accept bus travel in its current form to be sustainable or beneficial. The current fleet is too polluting and costs and availability of services are too limiting for modern standards of living. Improved cycle network and pedestrian links would help, especially expanding out from rail heads, or schools, but these too often are compromised by nasty road junctions placing users at unacceptable risk.

Fuel security and cost is a key issue for affordable living, but also location of industry, jobs and skills. If we are to remain competitive we need to have renewable and local sources of energy and power generation. Better use of the river system could provide local power generation with small weirs and dams. I do not want more solar farms to be approved as they take away land from Agricultural production, but I would encourage relaxation of controls on building mounted PVs and heat pumps. I am also in favour of wind turbines.

Tree coverage is key and there should be policies protecting our existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows, but backed up by enforcement. New tree planting needs to be encouraged especially alongside roads and in built up areas. In rural areas new and restored hedges with ecological corridors at field edges are required or between poly tunnels. New woodland planting on low grade agricultural land, or as screening for new development is also necessary.

There is a huge opportunity to increase active travel locally which would bring enormous air quality, traffic reduction, health and wellbeing benefits, along with long-term savings to the health service in particular.

Solar panels and battery storage should be mandatory on all new housing and will help address concerns around energy shortages, pollution, dependency on foreign supplies, and contribute towards lower cost solutions.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Well. It is pretty difficult to go for just three of these options . All are important in different ways and not mutually exclusive.

We have to protect our environment. We cannot keep building more and more housing to the detriment of the environment.

All are important and most are interlinked, so all should be considered.

Habitat creation and increasing tree coverage is just replacing what has possibly been destroyed and easy to achieve here in Tonbridge and Malling. Renewable energy is going to have to be made accessible to all sooner rather than later. That seems to be the most sensible way to future proof our energy provision.

---

**User Response: Text**

All measures are important to help climate change and people want to live in the development

The south-east will be most affected by global heating - tree coverage is shown to reduce temperatures in the vicinity by a few degrees. This will be very important. Trees chosen should be somewhat climate change resilient.

Building non-energy efficient homes is a nonsense, and will cost more in the long term in retrofitting. Better to be done on initial construction.

All homes should have the solar panels as an integral part of the roof and raised above ground in flood zone areas i.e. future proofed.( This will reduce developers profits but if they can't do this they don't get the contract). All sites to have indigenous trees. These few methods would go a long way to produce homes for the future.

long term solutions

All measures are important to address climate change and meet our targets

No response

Renewable or low carbon energy and energy efficient homes / buildings are essential to mitigate climate change, and active travel opportunities may help to alleviate road congestion

All climate change measures are important. It's not appropriate to pick and choose between alternatives.

to make a positive difference

We don't need to create new habitats - we have these already and we need to avoid destroying them by building on the Greenbelt. It is important that we use MMC for more sustainable and efficient home building and that new homes are highly energy efficient - EPC rating A or B. Finally reducing the need for car journeys is a priority, so the promotion of walking and cycling is important however that is only possible where developments are close to new or existing services, shops and amenities so it is possible and practical to provide the necessary infrastructure and the proximity that walking and cycling requires for the average person.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

---

**User Response: Text**

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Likely to have the biggest impact on reducing emissions and improving biodiversity.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Climate change must be top of agendas - society must bring government to action and legislation must be changed

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

There is a huge opportunity to increase active travel locally which would bring enormous air quality, traffic reduction, health and wellbeing benefits, along with long-term savings to the health service in particular. Solar panels and battery storage should be mandatory on all new housing and will help address concerns around energy shortages, pollution, dependency on foreign supplies, and contribute towards lower cost solutions. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

travel less cars

efficiency is more beneficial to users

habitat we need wild life to make us smile

Supporting wildlife and diversity. We have seen a dramatic decrease in garden birds in our own garden over the last 20 years. most likely due t the destruction of habitat and use of pesticides.

---

**User Response: Text**

Tree cover to assist in carbon reduction

agricultural land supports self sufficient food supply and assist in preventing flooding in areas already affected by climate change and seasonal weather.

Some of these options, whilst laudable, are very minor in terms of their impact on Climate Change. I have chosen the 3 options that seem to me to offer the most benefit in terms of greenhouse gas emissions.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover - increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. In order to reduce climate change and destruction to our environment

Other - There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

All of the objectives are worthy but my choices are to increase biodiversity & mitigate climate risks.

Wish I could have chosen them all! Trees are key. Plus building to last, not the 10 year life span of some of the current new builds which must be challenged and improved. We also have to shift our focus to biodiversity gain in everything we do.

We need better built house, the free market is not providing this and so it needs to be pushed into delivering these benefits.

no comment

A combination of less energy consumption, more environmentally friendly travel and better infrastructure.

Active travel opportunities - reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings - by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additional, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc) so that homes, schools, hospitals, and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough - the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.



---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity and is hugely important

Tree cover increase biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction

As said above: this list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

These are the main items that will assist climate change

All new built homes should be required to be green with photovoltaic tiles and energy efficient. Air-source or ground source heat pumps should be required

Three options is not enough because meadows and trees are also vital.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings - less gas/electricity usage to heat buildings.

Multi-functional green infrastructure - helps mitigate Co2 emissions and, in the case of recreation, gives residents somewhere to enjoy the natural environment and stay healthy / exercise.

Decentralised renewable and/or low carbon energy generation - renewables are essential for future energy consumption requirements and security (i.e. want to avoid relying on other countries)

I do think all the above measures are important, and only didn't select 'Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows)' as a top-three priority as I believe that if the TMB greenbelt is left untouched we already have good natural habitats.

The selected items will probably have the greatest impact on Carbon reduction.

Habitat creation- supports wildlife and biodiversity

Tree cover

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-offs from fields and inadequate drainage

All are equally important and work in combination.

Habitat creation supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

---

**User Response: Text**

Need to maintain the environment for local wildlife.

It is a climate emergency and those 3 will have the most significant effect on mitigating CO2 generation. However all measures are important

Mitigation and adaptation to climate change has to be a priority as well as retaining and improving natural habitats and biodiversity.

All measures are important to help climate change and meet our targets.

All measures are important to help climate change and meet our targets

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

All measures are important to address climate change for us now and future generations.

I would like to have selected them all

All these measures are important but the three chosen would have the most impact on reducing the carbon footprint which according to the boroughs own climate change strategy needs to achieve carbon neutral by 2030

They can be easily and effectively achieved locally.

This selection are within the capacity & scope of the T & M Local Plan & local Council themselves to fulfill the Objectives & requirements of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objectives being 'to reduce greenhouse gas

---

**User Response: Text**

emissions to minimise climate change' (objective 10). This should form part of the SA framework that is and will be used to appraise spatial strategy and policy options for the T & M Local Plan, ensuring that the implications for climate change are understood AND addressed .

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains

It is important to address climate change now and for future generations.

The natural environment is fragile and needs human intervention to sustain it.

This borough has flooding issues but shortage of water for homes too!

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all of their own energy needs, and export any surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that creates kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough, the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As stated above: This list should not be presented as options but instead viewed as a whole depending on the site that is under consideration.

Seems to me to be the most viable and meeting requirements.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy eUcient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy eUciency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own

---

**User Response: Text**

energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

**Active travel opportunities** – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

**Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings** – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

**Habitat creation** - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings Habitat creation – built fabric (eg swift bricks) Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows) Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) Multi-functional green infrastructure (recreation, carbon sinks and biodiversity net gain) Passive design (orientation, layout, landscaping) Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (eg green roofs, water butts, retention ponds) Tree coverage - increased Other – please state below adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Sustainable travel infrastructure reduces the need for car travel. all my options would help to reduce emissions

---

**User Response: Text**

and make for nicer places to live.

Active travel to reduce carbon emissions (less use of cars) - Could adopt hydrogen powered transport (trains and buses) as in other European countries (e.g. Germany and Sweden)

The other two would make for better place to live and protect natural habitats and wildlife e.g. bees (natural meadows) which are vital to farming communities

Maintaining alternative energy sources are a must for any new development, all houses to be fitted with solar panels, and car charging units. In the rural areas walking, cycling, paths and bus services are essential not a luxury. Site layouts are to have more thought to parking facilities. garages/car ports NEED to be next to their respective housing properties to allow the car charging units, powered by the solar panels on the building to be used.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Reduced energy consumption

Drainage is important as are wildlife also energy efficient buildings/

Climate change should be the ultimate priority and green space should be conserved / unaltered

Development must take account of our environment and local management policies should be strident in ensuring that every new building makes use of green, renewable materials and systems. The plan must seek to reduce the impact of greenhouse gasses and emissions and strive to deliver the best environment for the population now and going forward. The strategies adopted now will be impacting generations to come and it is our responsibility now to do everything in our power to deliver a development policy that does not damage the environment but delivers a sustainable built and natural environment for all to enjoy. The future costs of refurbishing substandard buildings should not be left to future generations, we have the opportunity to make a stand and control the manner in which our environment is going to develop. We must not shirk that responsibility by conceding to unrealistic and damaging central government targets purely to satisfy ill-considered policies.

They protect the natural environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Energy efficient building, transport solutions make it easier for everyone to save energy and biodiversity is also important

They are all important, so I have tried to select those which will have the most significant influence on reducing climate change effects.

we need to reduce our carbon footprint

Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy

make all efforts to minimise flooding for now and in the future.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new building adheres to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering

---

**User Response: Text**

better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.  
Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.  
Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.  
As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

This question shouldn't have been limited to 3 options.

It is vital that we reverse biodiversity loss and counter climate change.

These two threats to our environment and lives are at the top of my list of priorities.

No resposne

Energy efficient buildings are a necessity in todays world, with ever increasing energy costs and I'm always for more trees, which provide natural shade, absorb Co2 and create habitats for wildlife.

You need to be told that electric cars still take up road space and cause congestion. the only active travel that matters is walking wheeling and cycling.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of

---

**User Response: Text**

the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Natural solutions are more preferable in my opinion.

Trying to choose 3 options is ridiculous. In other questions an 'All are equally important' option is given. All these measures are important for future sustainable living. Although I believe we are already too late, we must still give it our best shot

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.  
There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Question 49

Which local policy requirements are most important to you?

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

? *We need to reduce our carbon footprint*

? *Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy*

? *Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.*

The most important thing is good insulation to reduce heating and possibly cooling costs. The green infrastructure should offset some of a developments carbon footprint. SuDS will reduce the amount of run-off in monsoon conditions.

All provide non-evasive natural provisions. All the others save for tree coverage and Swift bricks fail to add anything to assist biodiversity or to replace what has been lost as a result of the development.



---

**User Response: Text**

We have to think to the future on climate change. The Government is dragging it heels changing legislation and it is killing out havbtat.

Active travel improves well-being and reduces car usage. Energy efficient buildings are good for the environment and reduce energy bills. Multi-purpose green infrastructure provides recreational use and biodiversity gains.

Increases bio diversity.

As i have said i was born in a country village that i have seen lost over the years i know i will never see it back as it was when i was alad but we need to get back to as near as we can for the future youngsters to enjoy the freedom of life in the woods meadows we had then

Flooding to be minimised as a real issue in parts of this community. Reduced carbon footprint.

All items listed are important, however in terms of immediate benefit I believe these 3 items create biggest benefit.

More trees are required as there is little vegetation in new developments amongst homes.

The UK has to look to the future, climate change may or may not happen, but whatever happens insulation of buildings to reduce energy consumption, and country dependency on energy from abroad must be a good thing.

Generally I would want to preserve what little we still do have in the north east and east of the borough in terms of natural habitat and conservation.

Also of course belatedly building an energy strategy of our own to cope with the global energy price fluctuations...but that's not in the council remit I know.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains. With increase warming and likely more flash flooding, along with unpredictable weather conditions - it cannot be underestimated the importance of likely flooding.

They are all important and that was not an option

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity, assists in carbon reduction and increases interception storage of water leading to increased lag time and reducing flood risk. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run off from fields and inadequate drains

reduce carbon footprint

---

**User Response: Text**

reduce reliance on fossil fuels

minimise flooding

It is very difficult to choose only three, as they are all critically important, but these three address a range of issues.

I'm not climate change is a scam and unproven except in models. Real-life data including that of the IPCC show that there has been no significant warming in many years. Until you can give me real-life data that Tonbridge and Malling Council are responsible for Global Warming / Climate Change it will be just a money pit and a complete waste of time, resources and money.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

---

**User Response: Text**

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

we have a responsibility to improve our environment for ourselves, our children and the animals we have affected. This is to provide sustainable development, prevent climate issues and improve health.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for nature, residents, visitors and businesses.

Insist all new builds are Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings with Habitat creation – built fabric (eg swift bricks), Habitat creation – natural (eg hedgerows), Modern Methods of Construction (MMC), Multi-functional green infrastructure (recreation, carbon sinks and biodiversity net gain), Passive design (orientation, layout, landscaping), Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (eg green roofs, water butts, retention ponds) and Tree coverage - increased, also adhering to the highest energy efficiency standards; by cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

Think my 3 choices will have the biggest impact. But I would be happy to see the local plan include all of the above.

Support wildlife, create tree cover to help carbon reduction,, help towards flooding prevention

---

## User Response: Text

They can be easily and effectively achieved locally and have significant impact.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (solar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

We need allow nature to flourish within and around any new, as well as existing, developments - it is the best way to mitigate the effects of climate change, as well as address issues of the well-being and mental health of the population.

It is very difficult to select just three - but if the focus is on transport (cutting usage of cars), energy efficient buildings which include solar panels and effective drainage systems, plus the orientation of the houses to maximise hours of sunshine as well as green landscaping to attract wildlife, then most of the ideas are covered.

PV panels and wind turbines, energy efficient buildings and tree coverage are the three most important features to me although all green measures should be considered.

The highest carbon emissions are from transport and heating and lighting buildings. Without addressing this **now** carbon neutral by 2030 cannot be achieved. **However ALL the measures are important.** Planning policy should ensure dwellings for the future are zero carbon and contribute to the provision of renewable energy. Any large development should aim to be carbon zero, provide district heating and address relieving the infrastructure of drainage, sewerage, and water provision. Despite resistance to applying climate change policies in Tonbridge and Malling **other Local Planning Authorities have and are already requiring these high standards of development to meet the targets set by their Climate Change strategies.** Developers have the skills and technologies and are willing to use them where requirements are **applied fairly across the board for all developers and developments.** In terms of viability other **LPAs have shown that applying high standards has negligible impact on viability.** However **not** building to these standards will leave individual households vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and the Borough will have a legacy of building stock of substandard housing and other development that will require expensive and higher carbon emissions to install. Furthermore T&M will not be able to meet its own carbon neutral targets by 2030 and beyond. **The highest standards are required to fulfil the duty to deliver on the Climate Change Act 2008.**

---

**User Response: Text**

(As a further comment SUDS are a requirement of the EA on all development and not an option.)

- We have to stay ahead on climate change preserving our green spaces for future generations. These green spaces are the lungs of our communities.

The climate and nature are in emergency. These three measures are probably the most helpful (provided habitat creation and green infrastructure are undertaken properly - consult Kent Wildlife Trust). I would add decentralised renewable energy generation as another option.

They are the ones most likely to help with the risks while improving quality of life in other ways

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings - less gas/electricity usage to heat buildings. Use of ground source or air source heat pumps where space allows.

Multi-functional green infrastructure - helps mitigate Co2 emissions and, in the case of recreation, gives residents somewhere to enjoy the natural environment and stay healthy / exercise.

Decentralised renewable and/or low carbon energy generation - renewables are essential for future energy consumption requirements and security (i.e. want to avoid relying on other countries)

I do think all the above measures are important, and only didn't select 'Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows)' as a top-three priority as I believe that if the TMB greenbelt is left untouched we already have good natural habitats.

Energy efficiency is good for the environment and good for the user since it keeps costs down.

Habitat creation is vital for diversity, but also has been shown to reduce local temperatures, making for better places to live in summer heat.

Localised flooding is going to become more common - factoring this into the design stage and using sustainable, natural approaches to reducing it is important.

The threat posed by climate change to biodiversity is expected to increase, yet thriving ecosystems also have the capacity to help reduce the impacts of climate change. Ensuring tree canopies and habitat creation will only aid the battle of climate change. Destruction of natural spaces and habitats is known to significantly impact climate change as will non energy efficient buildings.

Habitats, trees and local renewable energy generation are all guaranteed sources of reducing carbon footprint (carbon capture through trees is one of the most reliable ways to capture CO2). The other options appear to be

---

### User Response: Text

those that will improve or evolve over time outside of the planning lens but keeping green spaces and habitats alive is the best focus for this plan.

Reduced cost of production of energy

Reduced consumption of energy and consequent cheaper costs

Reduced risk of localised flooding and with increased water retention

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

The threat posed by climate change to biodiversity is expected to increase, yet thriving ecosystems also have the capacity to help reduce the impacts of climate change. Ensuring tree canopies and habitat creation will only aid the battle of climate change. Destruction of natural spaces and habitats is known to significantly impact climate change as will non energy efficient buildings

This is the forward thinking, environmentally conscious approach.

1, Cycling / Walking can and should if provided well reduce traffic and therefore carbon emissions.

2, Habitat Creation. Good on the eye, good for wild creatures,

3, Water is rather important, it supports life. Utilising rain water by retention should be more widely promoted.

---

**User Response: Text**

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

It is imperative we take action to be more environmentally friendly and minimise negative impacts on the environment.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

As stated above they all have something to offer in terms of helping climate change or mitigating the effects dependent on the site.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-suUiciency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.



---

**User Response: Text**

Climate and nature needs our help.

Preparing for the future by making home ownership affordable for residents, while taking measures to protect and enhance the existing environment of the borough

to be honest - all are important and need to be considered

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

I would select them all, but I think these address the climate situation the best.

SUDS can be combined with habitat creation. Tree cover can also be included in habitat creation. soil habitat is also important to capture carbon and ensure food security through improved natural fertility options

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

---

**User Response: Text**

There is a huge opportunity to increase active travel locally which would bring enormous air quality, traffic reduction, health and wellbeing benefits, along with long-term savings to the health service in particular. Solar panels and battery storage should be mandatory on all new housing and will help address concerns around energy shortages, pollution, dependency on foreign supplies, and contribute towards lower cost solutions. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

The Local Plan has a unique opportunity to promote carbon abating and BioDiversity policies. Passive house design incorporates energy efficiency. It can be further argued that TMBC and the Local Plan has an opportunity to consider approaches for linking energy services offers to local decentralised energy development. This can be encouraged through partnering relationships with energy suppliers, DNOs and renewable generation suppliers. An integrated energy policy is very important for the sustainable future of T&M.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier

---

**User Response: Text**

alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings Habitat creation – built fabric (eg swift bricks) Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows) Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) Multi-functional green infrastructure (recreation, carbon sinks and biodiversity net gain) Passive design (orientation, layout, landscaping) Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (eg green roofs, water butts, retention ponds) Tree coverage - increased Other – please state below adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration

Water is precious. Trees have multiple benefits, including the capture of carbon.

As above

Energy efficient buildings are a necessity in todays world and go hand in hand with preserving and improving the environment.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings

Habitat creation – built fabric (eg swift bricks)

Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows)

Modern Methods of Construction (MMC)

Multi-functional green infrastructure (recreation, carbon sinks and biodiversity net gain)

Passive design (orientation, layout, landscaping)

Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (eg green roofs, water butts, retention ponds)

Tree coverage - increased

Other – please state below

Adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that

---

**User Response: Text**

homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Long term solutions

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

reasons are obvious

We need to preserve the countryside and encourage nature, both of these are integral to our village identity.

---

**User Response: Text**

Water is precious. Trees have multiple benefits, including the capture of carbon.

because of local concerns

Natural habitat creation and more trees would be more attractive

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

It's what I believe is required

We need to reduce our impacts on the environment and so this can most effectively and significantly be done through changing our energy suppliers to use only renewable and localised sources.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat

All common sense and self explanatory

Because we need these as an absolute minimum to help combat existing issues, never mind potential future problems. Ideally, we need them all, but these are vital.

They are all essential if we are to achieve zero carbon targets therefore they should be fundamental to the plan.

It is difficult to decide but are probably 3 most environmental friendly options

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all

---

**User Response: Text**

their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important concerns depending on the site that is under consideration.

All new building should put climate change at its core and while all the above are valuable I think the three chosen make most difference

This gives individuals an opportunity to take control and not leave it to others.

This part of UK is already on the verge of water shortage and the measures I have selected all contribute towards water conservation and runoff reduction. Also to reduced risk of flooding, given the increasing intensity of rainfall.

we need net zero housing that is resilient to climate change.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (solar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

N/a

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER: More than 5 options on the list are important.  
Active travel (cycling and walking), affordable housing for rent (council owned), biodiversity and ecology, energy efficiency, Renewable energy generation (eg photovoltaic cells), sustainable drainage, water efficiency.

Development must take account of our environment and local management policies should be strident in ensuring that every new building makes use of green, renewable materials and systems. The plan must seek to reduce the impact of greenhouse gasses and emissions and strive to deliver the best environment for the population now and going forward. The strategies adopted now will be impacting generations to come and it is our responsibility now to do everything in our power to deliver a development policy that does not damage the environment but delivers a sustainable built and natural environment for all to enjoy. The future costs of refurbishing substandard buildings should not be left to future generations, we have the opportunity to make a stand and control the manner in which our environment is going to develop. We must not shirk that responsibility by conceding to unrealistic and damaging central government targets purely to satisfy ill-considered policies.

The houses we build now need to be fit for the future and factor in climate change and sustainability

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

They all seem important. I am not an expert. These are just things that seem to me to be important.

it is important that given the speed of climate change that any new developments are built in a sustainable manner, not just in terms of the materials used, but also built to be carbon neutral. However, all of the points above are important.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses. Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon

---

**User Response: Text**

reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.  
Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.  
Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.  
As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.  
Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.  
Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.  
As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

I think they are the measures with the biggest impact.

Reducing need for consuming energy.



---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat cultivation for a diverse range of wildlife

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change.

Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (solar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from

movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business

caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

All measures listed are important but the ones I have highlighted are most effective to help best with the climate change.

Freedom from dependence on the grid and the carbon-based solutions it ties us into. More energy efficient homes makes sense to utilise the newly produced power. Meadows acknowledge the broad habitats needed to nurture biodiversity and farmland enables both habitats to be sustained and food to be produced, whilst protecting current housing areas from flooding.

a lot of inefficiencies and poor performance can be designed out through passive measures such as orientation, solar gain, thermal mass etc. Passivhaus standard or similar could be adopted. Bio-diversity and ecology goes a long way so the production of habitats is a 'no-brainer'. SUDs and renewables are also incredibly important.

---

**User Response: Text**

Sustainable drainage systems - due to increased flood risk associated with climate change.

Energy efficient buildings - a significant contribution to reducing carbon emissions, and beneficial to residents, given rising cost of energy.

Natural habitat creation - best way to protect biodiversity.

Maintaining alternative energy sources are a must for any new development, all houses to be fitted with solar PV's, and car charging units. In the rural areas, walking, cycling paths and bus services are essential, not a luxury. Site layouts should have more thought to parking facilities. Garages/car ports need to be next to their respective properties to allow the car charging unit, powered by solar panels, to be used.

See response to Q2

Nature over money!!

Environmental issues that affect us today need to be considered as well as future goals. Flood risk is very well and there is very little chance to respond on this during the survey.

Climate change should be one of the most important consideration with any development. the use of sustainable materials, and green infrastructures are essential to the area.

1. Giving priority to energy efficient, future-proofed buildings is fundamental to achieving National, County and Local targets for achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2050. We would hope to see MMC, passive design and habitat creation all included in the standards set for future development, as well as provision for natural habitats and increased tree canopies.
2. Increasing provision of green travel options has been mentioned elsewhere in my answers, However, "green" must also be done in a way that promotes safety.

I have selected the 3 which I think will be most effective. They are all important.

Too many trees have already been taken.

1. Energy efficiency already is and is becoming even more important in terms of climate change but also as a result of the rising cost of living. Building energy efficient buildings can make the most important

---

**User Response: Text**

contribution to climate change of any of the elements listed.

1. Of almost equal importance is the need to deliver new habitats and biodiversity net gain as part of new developments. Sites which can deliver significant net gain on site i.e. rather than simply buying credits should be favoured in the allocation process as a result.

Concrete and steel construction will on its own break the carbon limits.

Essential for our survival

Density of housing should be such that it integrates with the natural surroundings rather than destroys it. As stated in my other answers, smaller developments dotted around would be better than larger ones destroying large pockets of countryside.

Priority to maintain wildlife and ecological benefits as this enhances the residents' environments - both mentally and physically - as well, of course, as protecting our native species, flora and fauna.

I consider it necessary to maintain a natural environment to the existing Hildenborough Village, including Hilden Park and the countryside around and also to maintain the village identity and environment.

It is a climate emergency and those 3 will have the most significant effect on mitigating CO2 generation.

However all measures are important.

**Active travel opportunities** – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

**Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings** – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

**Habitat creation** - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

---

**User Response: Text**

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Councils and developers need to be proactive re climate change

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy. Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

Travel Opportunities need infrastructure. Plan for this new development should balance with Infrastructure availability, in this particular areas of 59821, 59823 and 59683 infrastructure is lacking and will not sustain so many new homes with new families with their health, education and transport needs.

We have mentioned above all those options are already present as natural habitat and green space. New large developments are going to damage the environment and disturb the equilibrium. So we strongly object this proposal in those 3 site areas mentioned above.

No Response

We have no choice - we have to make our new developments as climate friendly as possible. The future depends on our decisions made today.

One or two aspects actioned won't make the difference, but all aspects together will make a difference to the environment and help mitigate climate change

All have a role to play but these three should have the greatest impact on net CO2 emissions.

No response

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering

---

**User Response: Text**

better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

There is a huge opportunity to increase active travel locally which would bring enormous air quality, traffic reduction, health and wellbeing benefits, along with long-term savings to the health service in particular. Solar panels and battery storage should be mandatory on all new housing and will help address concerns around energy shortages, pollution, dependency on foreign supplies, and contribute towards lower cost solutions. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Would like to have included them all. Buildings are a major contributor to UK GHG emissions. The selected options make the biggest difference

The hundred year floods have happened 3 times in the last 25 years in East Peckham, any development plans need to consider this. The last lot of houses built in the flood area - Rose Mews on the old Rose and Crown Pub site have been lifted, this is ok for them but what about the impact on the houses and businesses in the immediate area. The planning application submitted by the developers stated that it had not flooded - there is enough television footage of Christmas 2013 to see clearly that this was a lie.

How can they prove that this development won't push the flood water further into the opposite road Medway Meadows, the houses here have been flooded several times and each time it gets worse due to the climate changes.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

---

**User Response: Text**

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

We need to maintain as much nature for developments to facilitate environment and climate equilibrium

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation – natural. Reducing carbon emissions will go some way to meeting Tonbridge and Malling’s target of becoming net zero by 2030, but it is essential that residual carbon emissions are offset/inset by high quality habitat creation. Habitats, including wetlands, grasslands and woodlands sequester carbon whilst also providing benefits for wildlife and for residents.

Multi-functional – GI. This option is very similar to the title ‘habitat creation – natural’ and the same comments as above apply. It is important that the right habitat is delivered in the right place, pulling on emerging Nature Based Solutions (Carbon, BNG, Nutrient Neutrality – as appropriate) to direct and finance habitat creation within the Borough.

We have to be sensible and pragmatic about the cost of green projects which, while being ideal, have little or no impact in the larger scheme of things. The poor local tax payer ends up footing the bill for vanity projects.

Climate change is likely to increase the risk of flooding. Therefore sites already at risk of flooding are likely to become more vulnerable over time. Furthermore, it is important to protect existing floodplains to maximise floodwater dispersal and reduce the risk and extent of flooding elsewhere.

---

**User Response: Text**

We believe porous drives etc need to be considered to help with water flow and avoid flooding risks. We need to be more energy effecient going forward.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.  
Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Tree coverage, new habitats for nature recovery, and multi-functional greenspace are interventions that will deliver multiple benefits and best address the nature and climate crises together. While built environment solutions may be delivered as an integral part of developments, these natural solutions are more likely to require local plan policies to support their delivery.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings at designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

Insufficient time available to discuss this

---

**User Response: Text**

Given increased energy costs, well constructed buildings with excellent insulation is fairly obvious

I live in Shipbourne where we have no gas supply so a lot of oil boilers. There are no electric car charging facilities unless people install on their property. I don't even have a driveway so I struggle to work out how I could have an electric car with nowhere to charge it.

All new developements should have solar panels, heat exchange units.

All things which improve the environment and wellbeing

Whilst they are all important, these should have the most impact upon offsetting the challenges of climate change.

All measures are important to address climate change and meet targets

As all the proposed developments are going to destroy the environment, the effects need to be mitigated as much as possible.

Overall combined climate change and biodiversity imperatives.

Supports wildlife

increase biodiversity

Active travel opportunities also provide significant public health benefits.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

Climate Change is the key issue of our time and must be front and central to the plan.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.



---

**User Response: Text**

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from elds and inadequate drains.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings

Habitat creation – built fabric (eg swift bricks)

Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows)

Modern Methods of Construction (MMC)

Multi-functional green infrastructure (recreation, carbon sinks and biodiversity net gain)

Passive design (orientation, layout, landscaping)

Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (eg green roofs, water butts, retention ponds)

Tree coverage - increased

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering

better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better

quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy

consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do

to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy

generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that

homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or

all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the

borough. Technology already exists that create kinetic energy from

movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to

safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been

highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business

caused by our reliance on imported energy.

---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

To protect ourselves and our environment

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Active travel opportunities - offers significant opportunity for carbon reduction.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Multi-functional green infrastructure - allows most return on investment of green pounds.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

---

**User Response: Text**

- Habitat creation- supports wildlife and diversity.
- Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.
- There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

**We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat**

We support the need to foster more sustainable active travel opportunities, by directing growth to the main urban areas that is commensurate with the sustainability credentials of such areas. New development also offers opportunities to deliver energy efficient homes in line with building regulations, and on green field / belt sites, greater opportunities for net tree and accessible green infrastructure gains.

Rydon does not have a view at this time.

**Reduce carbon footprint****Future proof our reliance on fossil fuels****Make efforts to minimize flooding**

The highest carbon emissions are from transport and heating and lighting buildings. Without addressing this now carbon neutral by 2030 cannot be achieved. However ALL the measures are important. Planning policy should ensure dwellings for the future are zero carbon and contribute to the provision of renewable energy. Any large development should aim to be carbon zero, provide district heating and address relieving the infrastructure of drainage, sewerage, and water provision. Despite resistance to applying climate change policies in Tonbridge and Malling other Local Planning Authorities have and are already requiring these high standards of development to meet the targets set by their Climate Change strategies. Developers have the skills and technologies and are willing to use them where requirements are applied fairly across the board for all developers and developments. In terms of viability other LPAs have shown that applying high standards has negligible impact on viability. However not building to these standards will leave individual households vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and the Borough will have a legacy of building stock of substandard housing and other development that will require expensive and higher carbon emissions to install. Furthermore T&M will not be able to meet its own carbon neutral targets by 2030 and beyond. The highest standards are required to fulfil the duty to deliver on the Climate Change Act 2008.

(As a further comment SUDS are a requirement of the EA on all development and not an option.)

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint

---

### User Response: Text

- Reduce our reliance on fossil fuel energy through utilizing a mix of energy sources
- Build in at source better insulation and low-energy heating/cooling facilities in new housing

Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

We need to reduce our carbon footprint

- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

The highest carbon emissions are from transport and heating and lighting buildings. Without addressing this **now** carbon neutral by 2030 cannot be achieved. **However, ALL the measures are important.** Planning policy should ensure dwellings for the future are zero carbon and contribute to the provision of renewable energy. Any large development should aim to be carbon zero, provide district heating and address relieving the infrastructure of drainage, sewerage, and water provision. Despite resistance to applying climate change policies in Tonbridge and Malling **other Local Planning Authorities have and are already requiring these high standards of development to meet the targets set by their Climate Change strategies.** Developers have the skills and technologies and are willing to use them where requirements are **applied fairly across the board for all developers and developments.** In terms of viability other LPAs **have shown that applying high standards has negligible impact on viability.** However not building to these standards will leave individual households vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and the Borough will have a legacy of building stock of substandard housing and other development that will require expensive and higher carbon emissions to install. Furthermore T&M will not be able to meet its own carbon neutral targets by 2030 and beyond. **The highest standards are required to fulfil the duty to deliver on the Climate Change Act 2008.**

(As a further comment SUDS are a requirement of the EA on all development and not an option.)

Gladman support the Council's consideration of climate change measures and recognise that many of the measures identified can be delivered through sustainable development. Active travel opportunities, energy efficient dwellings, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems and passive design can all be accommodated on well located residential development sites.

Any climate change measures the Council choses to include within a policy in the emerging Local Plan should be suitably considered to ensure that they do not preclude sustainable development coming forward. Measures should be appropriately assessed and be suitably in line with the most up to date building regulations to ensure that they do not impact viability and stop much needed houses from coming forward.

- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy.
- We need to reduce our carbon footprint.
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

---

**User Response: Text**

West Malling is principally an urban centre in a rural landscape. These priorities are chosen to reflect our needs rather than those of the wider borough. The chosen priorities provide a positive contribution to reducing carbon emissions as well as contributing to mitigating and adapting to climate change by increasing habitat for enhancing biodiversity and providing increased access to the natural world with associated benefits for wellbeing and quality of life.

Our first priority is for energy efficient, future-proofed buildings. This seems fundamental to achieving National, County and Local targets for achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2050. We would hope to see MMC, passive design and habitat creation all included in the standards set for future development

Our second is for habitat creation – natural (e.g. meadows, hedgerows). Meadows and Hedgerows are easier to achieve in West Malling and the surrounding agricultural land than new woodland. Increasing hedgerows and upgrading existing grassland will offer a comparable carbon sink, with improved habitat for biodiversity, alongside improved air quality and the associated health benefits, and enhanced quality of life. Of course, we would like to support increasing the tree canopy and optimising opportunities for improving habitat for biodiversity.

Our third priority is multi-functional green infrastructure (recreation, carbon sinks and biodiversity net gain). Maximising the potential of urban centres to contribute to reducing carbon emissions and boosting quality of life and health should be a priority, e.g. through increased use of photo voltaic tiles, green roofs, creating cycle paths and traffic calming, alongside pedestrianised areas with more street trees. Better co-ordinated, cheap public transport using clean energy. Increased sports facilities with playing fields acting as carbon sinks and infrastructure to encourage users to access them on foot or cycling or public transport.

All the measures identified are important, though the ability to focus/ deliver these will vary by site. The most effective, and consistent with national policy approach, would be focus on the New Homes Standard, and other accredited schemes such as Building for Life, to ensure consistency, and a level playing field for the industry. For example, some sites might benefit from technologies such as ground source heat pumps, others not. The costs for any technologies required, above and beyond national 32 minimums (on the basis that national Building Regulations are increasing the requirements), should be fully tested for viability/ feasibility.

All are important.  
The best way to start improvements is to avoid actions which immediately have a detrimental impact. In the light of the current energy crisis, well-insulated homes must be a priority for new-builds. Monitoring of construction is critical to ensuring that meet the insulation guidelines.

All are important.  
The best way to start improvements is to avoid actions which immediately have a detrimental impact.  
In the light of the current energy crisis, well-insulated homes must be a priority for new-builds. Monitoring of construction is critical to ensuring that meet the insulation guidelines.

---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains.

We have to protect our environment. We cannot keep building more and more housing to the detriment of the environment.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat. How should development be managed?

**Viability**

When considering the various requirements that could be introduced, we have to be mindful of the impact on viability, and therefore deliverability, of development. If the economic cost is too high the development is likely to be unviable, which means that no homes would be provided. That is an outcome that must be avoided if we are to positively address our assessed development needs. While the recent changes to the Building Regulations will make a positive contribution to mitigating impacts on climate change, there will be an economic cost of achieving them.

Once it has gone, its gone forever

---

**User Response: Text**

- **We need to reduce our carbon footprint**
- **Reduce our reliance on fossil fuel energy through utilizing a mix of energy sources**
- **Build in at source better insulation and low-energy heating/cooling facilities in new housing**
- **Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.**

To stop or reduce global warming and make for a greener world.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat  
How should development be managed?  
Viability

**We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat by building on vast amount of our green land that can never be retrieved once we have built on it. Houses for who? Those that can afford buying one/2 or 3 houses to add to their portfolio? Taking down trees, shrubs hedges all contribute to climate change and building heat and carbon emitting houses contribute to Climate Change.**

How should development be managed? Viability

It is a climate emergency and those 3 will have the most significant effect on mitigating CO2 generation. However, all measures are important.

Habitat creation supports wildlife and biodiversity increase tree coverage increase biodiversity and helps reduce carbon.

They can be effectively they easily achieved locally

- **We need to reduce our carbon footprint.**
- **Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy.**
- **Make all efforts to minimize flooding now and in the future.**

- We have to stay ahead on climate change preserving our green spaces for future generations. These green spaces are the lungs of our communities.

We have to be sensible and pragmatic about the cost of green projects which, while being ideal, have little or no

---

**User Response: Text**

impact in the larger scheme of things. The poor local tax payer ends up footing the bill for vanity projects.

There has been no real mention of extending the existing infrastructure around Borough Green and Ightham. What about Improved roads and access to the motorway M20, which would all need to come through Wrotham Heath; this is already a bottle neck. Also, there is no specific reference to the need for additional schools, hospitals, local surgeries, drainage, water supply etc.?

They made sense.

The existing drainage systems cannot cope with very heavy rain.

Energy usage needs to be reduced.

Climate change arguments are a 'narrative' which is not proven by science. There are plenty of 'expert' technical papers worldwide questioning methods of analysis. These are reputable but are suppressed.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat.

We have to act positively on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are destroying our local habitat

How should development be managed? Viability

When considering the various requirements that could be introduced, we have to be mindful of the impact on viability, and therefore deliverability, of development. If the economic cost is too high the development is likely to be unviable, which means that no homes would be provided. That is an outcome that must be avoided if we are to positively address our assessed development needs. While the recent changes to the Building Regulations will



---

**User Response: Text**

make a positive contribution to mitigating impacts on climate change, there will be an economic cost of achieving them.

We have to protect our environment and not destroy it. We cannot keep building more and more housing to the detriment of the environment.

Habitat creation - support wild life and biodiversity. Tree coverage increases to assist carbon reduction. There has been localised flooding due to inadequate drains and run off from fields.

We have to protect our environment and not destroy it. We cannot keep building more and more housing to the detriment of the environment.

Q.46 above -

migratory birds should be a key issue, as should all habitat space for wildlife, especially where the species are threatened and on the Red List, such as Turtle Doves, which nest in the area in some numbers, and significantly, on some of the sites earmarked for development. It is illegal to disturb these.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy

Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

Habitat creation offsets the effect of development, passive design is sympathetic to the environment, sustainable drainage systems help manage the effects of change in our climate.

We have briefly outlined some of our reasons, as follows:

? Habitat creation - given the loss of natural habitat and bio-diversity to built developments.

As noted in Q.35, established habitats are far more valuable than artificially created ones.

? Multi-functional green infrastructure – given the land development pressures, we need to realise more benefits of our green spaces, while balancing recreational/bio-diversity needs.

? Sustainable drainage – multi-functionality of public amenity and drainage features is key to maximising the wider benefits; incl. providing more sustainable surface water management, better water quality, improved bio-diversity and better public amenity/recreational spaces.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy

Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

---

## User Response: Text

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

**) We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitats by building on vast amounts of our green land that can never be retrieved once we have built on it. Houses for who? Those that can afford buying one/2 or 3 houses to add to their portfolio? Taking down trees, shrubs, hedges all contribute to climate change and building heat and carbon emitting houses contribute to Climate Change.**

How should development be managed? Viability

When considering the various requirements that could be introduced, we have to be mindful of the impact on viability, and therefore deliverability, of development. If the economic cost is too high the development is likely to be unviable, which means that no homes would be provided. That is an outcome that must be avoided if we are to positively address our assessed development needs. While the recent changes to the Building Regulations will make a positive contribution to mitigating impacts on climate change, there will be an economic cost of achieving them.

Active travel opportunities – Reducing car use by prioritising and delivering better more attractive and healthier alternatives is going to achieve a better quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings – by insisting all new buildings adhere to the highest energy efficiency standards we are cutting energy consumption at source which is the single most important thing we need to do to slow climate change. Additionally, building plans should include energy generation measures (polar/wind/ground source heat pumps etc.) so that homes, schools, hospitals and industrial buildings are designed to meet some or all their own energy needs, and export surplus to supply other areas of the borough. Technology already exists that create kinaesthetic energy from movement on paving and roads. Energy self-sufficiency should be a priority to safeguard the energy needs of the borough – the importance of this has been highlighted recently with the extreme hardship to households and business caused by our reliance on imported energy.

---

**User Response: Text**

Habitat creation - supports wildlife and biodiversity.

Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists in carbon reduction.

As said above: This list should not be presented as options but instead seen together as possibly important opportunities depending on the site that is under consideration.

All are important however future proofing any new buildings and creating natural habitat for wildlife is key to climate change.

Habitat creation offsets the effect of development, passive design is sympathetic to the environment, sustainable drainage systems help manage the effects of change in our climate.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

These are the key items.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat

Habitat creation - supports wildlife & biodiversity. Tree cover increases biodiversity and assists carbon reduction, There has been localised flooding in the past due to water run-off from fields and inadequate drains!

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy

---

**User Response: Text**

- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat

**We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat**

We have to be sensible and pragmatic about the cost of green projects which, while being ideal, have little or no impact in the larger scheme of things. The poor local tax payer ends up footing the bill for vanity projects.

We have to be sensible and pragmatic about the cost of green projects which, while being ideal, have little or no impact in the larger scheme of things. The poor local tax payer ends up footing the bill for vanity projects.

We must build more sustainable homes and protect our environment. All homes should be well insulated, energy efficient, use of renewables, and in small scale developments to preserve the local environment.

- We have to get ahead on climate change and preserve our green spaces for future generations

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat

viability

Climate change and biodiversity. We need biodiversity to preserve life on earth. Climate change is going to be the biggest cause of destruction going forward we have to think about it now. It is already almost too late. We can't waste another opportunity to get this right.  
How should development be managed? Viability

**We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing**

---

**User Response: Text**

**legislation, we are killing our habitat**

We have to protect our environment. We cannot keep building more and more housing to the detriment of the environment.

Cycling and walking lowers pollution, habitat creation is necessary for flora and fauna and SUDs would help to guard against drought.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

Sustainable development

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat  
How should development be managed? Viability

We have to be ahead of the game on climate change, while the Government drags its heels changing legislation, we are killing our habitat  
How should development be managed? Viability

Whatever we do it won't be enough. Many more things will emerge. Unfortunately we don't yet have a government who will prioritise climate and environmental issues as highly as it ought to be (i.e. the NUMBER 1 PRIORITY above everything else).

Promote healthy living.

---

## User Response: Text

Habitat creation offsets the effect of development, passive design is sympathetic to the environment, sustainable drainage systems help manage the effects of change in our climate.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

Habitat creation supports wildlife & biodiversity.

Trees increase biodiversity and helps carbon reduction there has been localised flooding in the past due to water run off from fields & inadequate drains.

To help stop pollution and to keep rural areas as rural as possible if developments happen to take place.

Answer: It is a climate emergency and those 3 will have the most significant effect on mitigating CO2 generation. However all measures are important.

- We need to reduce our carbon footprint
- Future proof our reliance on fossil fuel energy
- Make all efforts to minimise flooding now and in the future.

We have to be sensible and pragmatic about the cost of green projects which, while being ideal, have little or no impact in the larger scheme of things. The poor local tax payer ends up footing the bill for vanity projects.

- Tree coverage – increased
- Energy efficient, future-proofed buildings
  - Renewable energy – using for example photovoltaic solar panels and ASHP. Modern methods of construction to create buildings with low heat demand. Mitigate risk of overheating.
  - Target zero carbon
  - Fabric first approach and use of low carbon/locally sourced materials
- Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows)
  - Biodiversity net gain
  - Habitat creation – natural (eg meadows, hedgerows)
  - Biodiverse roofs
- We must urgently focus on the climate crisis, preserving our green spaces for future generations. These green spaces are the lungs of our communities.

---

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:16:08. Total records: 515

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18

Question: [Question 50] What are your reasons for selecting these particular...

### User Response: Text

This is a most ridiculous questionnaire!

I do not want anymore development in the area. This is why I moved from London over 35 years ago to get away from bloody development.

They address both the needs of biodiversity and humans

Green space protected, environment is protected, ensuring Tonbridge is a centre for green thinking and community

We need to be off fossil fuels ASAP

They are all essential to providing safe, sustainable places to live

as stated previously

The Council must adopt minimum space standards to ensure new homes are of a sufficient size.

Tonbridge needs more truly affordable (preferably social) housing for rent. I don't think we need any more 'luxury apartments', retirement flats or 'executive' - i.e. bigger - houses to buy.

Climate change isn't going anywhere, and it isn't just about global warming.

We need to protect diversity of species and manage changing weather patterns.

Ultimately your local plan should be about ensuring residents here actually live somewhere that is good for their health and wellbeing.

Self explanator

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater, we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Because green space, greens, grass verges and parks need to be kept for the area to be attractive and also have somewhere for the children to play. Not like they are planning in Kings Hill to build on every square inch of grass

Most developments do not prioritise parking and add to the problem in the local area. Access is also diminished

---

**User Response: Text**

for emergency vehicles and cleansing wagons. No regard to energy efficiency has been used in recent developments.

We must provide for our young adults

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

All new homes should be efficient, it is cheaper to build homes with ground source pumps, solar etc. than to retrofit.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.  
Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!  
Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

There is a need for affordable housing to buy rather than rent. In my opinion private landlords buying homes drives inflation in that market making homes even less affordable to those on limited budgets.  
The natural environment should not be lost as a result of development. Opportunities to protect ecology and improve biodiversity should be grasped.  
All new developments should be of the highest standards of energy efficiency to reduce waste and greenhouse gas emissions. Renewable energy should be incorporated to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels, improve the country's energy security and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.  
The recent hot summer and resultant water shortage has demonstrated that water is a precious commodity and must be conserved wherever possible.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

I want to see that our development (Bradbourne Fields Site 59450 and 59448) does not lose its green spaces. It is an amenity that is used by the residents for leisure activities, dog walking, picnics in the summer months. The trees around the perimeter and those on the green area itself provide a great aspect and offset the pollution that is generated by traffic on the A20 which runs down one side. We moved in when the development was being built and it was understood that the green spaces would remain a permanent feature.

Too many overpriced houses.

To offset high mortgage/rent costs then the utility use to heat and power needs to be reduced from the national infrastructure to be self sufficient

All are important, but these cover most areas.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

All 18 of the requirements are essential to the wellbeing of our communities and cannot be assessed in isolation.

To create a place to live in that has a sense of community through common useage of facilites and services, fuelled by local business opportunities, available within walking/bus distance, that is aesthestically pleasing with a focus on greenery and attractive buildings. That is my hope and Tonbridge is in a prime position to deliver such an existence. Please don't muck it up.

Climate change

I see these as the most important matters that have the greatest effects on urban living

Again all are important hard to choose

People need to be able to afford a roof over their heads, with affordable utility costs, and with green spaces in close proximity.

The prime aim of four of my five options is to meet the best interests of the householder by providing sufficient Parking, reducing energy, their safety and security and critically trying to get their internal space standards right. The RIBA REport the "The Case for Space" indicated that most new houses only have about 85% of the space required for good living. This is normally at the expense of storage space. Especially we should require lofts in houses to be decked down and not to use construction practices of removing this space by filling it with timber cross strutting but finding different marginally more expensive construction methods.

The fifth option is to provide the accommodation required by the elderly including the younger elderly to encourage them to vacate family sized accommodation for more manageable properties.

Please compare to Maidstone's developments. Does TMB want indiscriminate housing, at the profit of developers on once green fill sites at the detriment of the environment and the people who live in the Borough? Maidstone

---

**User Response: Text**

have railroad plans through without considering sustainability and the environment just to meet government quotas. I have just highlighted the environmental concerns restricted by the number I can tick.

Environmental and human concerns. If this project is not to involve the wanton destruction of nature, then far more needs to be done to redress the damage caused by these developments. Otherwise, our Borough will lose its rural character and become just another London suburb.

These are important aspects that add to the quality of life in the borough

They make sense!!!

As you can see through my answers , the green space and fields and woodlands of TM district are what brought me here. I choose to buy a house and start a family here so my son can grow up with fields around him and learn about nature and how important the world is. I came originally from dartford where when I was young was a small town with outlying green spaces , I chose to leave because they built on these spaces and they are lost. Now I see the threat of TMBC doing the same it makes me sad. This area is an area of fields , wildlife farming and beauty and because someone said in an office you need to build 15000 homes TMBC are rolling over and doing what they are told, it is disgusting. As per my answer above there should be negotiations renewable investments for lowering housing targets. Once green spaces are gone TMBC becomes another dartford where developers get rich people suffer and nature and beauty are lost. If green belt is lost shame on you and please let your children know it was you that helped destroy the natural world.

Climate change is clearly real and already impacting us. There is no point in building all of these houses for the increasing population if we are all going to die in 30 years time if we continue to neglect climate change.

This is Hadlow Parish Council's vision of how it would like to see the parish develop

Mix and match old , young and families . It would hopefully generate a caring community

Enable car recharging points to be easily available, enabling care support in own homes to individuals or village supported living; ensure areas are well connected and safe

The average cost of a house is about £350,000 but the actual cost of building it is about £200,000. So its important to require the developer to design well laid out comfortable energy efficient spacious accommodation with gardens and to pay for the infrastructure needed for this additional housing.

---

**User Response: Text**

community building

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

we need our open spaces. borough green can not sustain it's current demand for services and amenities. this plan would destroy the place and I'm sure I would not be the only person to remove my family from the borough were it to go ahead

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.

Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking.

The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

See previous questions

As stated previously, quality of life for all those of us fortunate enough to live in this Borough.

**Final Comment.**

**We congratulate you on consulting with current residents on the future Local Plan in this excellent document.**

**This questionnaire that the Council has produced is wide ranging, enlightening and comprehensive, and we have given it serious consideration.**

**In our responses we have tried to be constructive and helpful.**

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first-time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

---

**User Response: Text**

The Local Plan will presumably be set in law for some time ahead - this Council should show by example it has a responsible body of officers who care what happens to the area it covers.

Our younger children/teens need recreational facilities that can be used all year round.

There are few available houses for first time buyers so new houses need to be aimed at this market to keep future generations in the community they grew up in.

New build communities need parking to ensure roads are kept clear of traffic; most homes now have at least two cars.

People need to feel safe and secure in the communities they live in.

I love where I live but it is tricky getting home.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

NPPF 14 objectives.

---

**User Response: Text**

I see climate change as the biggest threat to our children and grandchildren. It will cause food scarcity if left unchecked, as well as droughts and floods. Active travel and avoiding private car use is one of the best ways citizens can reduce their CO2 footprint and should be encouraged. It will also reduce pollution, congestion and road rage. People will also become healthier.

In our area housing is too expensive for most young people, especially key workers. There are unfilled vacancies for most key worker roles, from care staff to drivers to farm workers. It is essential for people to be housed so I think there should be council housing to rent.

Energy efficiency to the highest standard is essential to address climate change and reduce energy bills. Higher density housing would be more travel and energy efficient, making public open greenspaces increasingly important. Public open space is important for creating community and for health and wellbeing.

We should insist that all new builds have access to frequent public transport and safe cycling and walking routes. Also that they should have the highest possible standards of insulation and solar panels on roofs (unless shaded), rainwater harvesting and heat pumps wherever possible. It is cheaper to install such technologies at the time of building than it is to retrofit later.

We need our future to genuinely be an improvement whilst recognising growth is inevitable we need to plan to do this in a way that supports nature and the climate. These principles create a living environment that is intrinsically linked with our own health and wellbeing. Sustainability and energy efficiency is crucial for everyone.

**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 congestion at pick up and drop off times.
- • Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227 - this is a junction with 4 way traffic where multiple accidents have been witnessed already.
- • 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. Both of these roads are often already made one-way due to parking.
- • Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.

---

## User Response: Text

### 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.

### 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 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 extreme 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.
- All three sites were immediately rejected by TMBC in the last Call for Sites due to their poor Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

### 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 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.



---

## User Response: Text

### 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.

### 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 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.

I think we have to be mindful of conserving our resources as we expand housing, so reducing water usage and generating renewable power are crucial to avoid massive increased demand. Water in particular is a precious resource, and we already have a hose pipe ban in there south east. The massive increase in dwellings planned will increase this demand significantly. We need to encourage walking and cycle wherever possible but need to recognise that this does not provide a 100% viable transport solution for everyone, and that cars will continue to be required. For this reason I have included parking as an essential requirement, both parking for individual dwellings, as well as an adequate provision in retail centres.

All of the above have equal importance in local policy. A number of the identified local policies will be governed by other legislation such as Building Regulations and it is not for the Local Plan to provide guidance which may, in time, be in conflict with such legislation.

However, it is the role of the Local Plan to identify suitable sites that are able to deliver on the objectives. Large scale sites (100+) are more likely to deliver the specific benefits identified as local priorities through economies of scale more than a scattered policy of allocating smaller sites in rural or semi rural locations.

---

**User Response: Text**

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first-time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

in order they are properly assessed

Most important in my opinion to achieve plan objectives.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young first time buyers. Older citizens are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

General health and well being from walking and cycling should be made a priority. Cycle and walking routes should be safe to use.

More and more each year there are hose pipe bans and concerns on water levels. Everyone should be encouraged to use less water and save rain water.

Water treatment plants should be able to cope with the extra demands from new builds and existing properties.

**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 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.

---

**User Response: Text**

- Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.

**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.

**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 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.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

It is essential that cheaper housing be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a great deal of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The resulting outcome is that surrounding streets have become oversubscribed for the parking of vehicles from new developments.

As above, we need to future proof ourselves energy wise.

---

**User Response: Text**

Any housing should be built with a view to mitigate Climate change

Local requirements should be to meet local needs, with mixed developments at optimised densities, providing adequate spacing for parking, for green spaces, for tree canopies and 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.

Too many questions without relevant information

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are Modern Methods of Construction Parking Public open space Renewable energy generation (eg photovoltaic cells) Safety and security Self-Build and/or Custom Housebuilding Specialist housing (elderly, eg care homes) Sustainable Drainage (eg water butts and green roofs) Water efficiency (consumption within the home) Other – please state below not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Local families find it extremely challenging when children wish to set up home in the area where they grew up.

These are important factors in achieving net zero

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

Providing the most useful housing provision with minimal environmental impact

---

**User Response: Text**

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

All are important but building the mix of housing which best suits local needs is paramount.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

These are mainly carbob reducing items except for residential parking which is usually insufficient to new developments approve by planners, e.g Kings Hill.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

May I also add that this a complicated way to protest about the proposed building of 1800 homes on the Grange Farm site.

It is no wonder people climb bridges and hang about in trees and bring the roads to a standstill to get noticed.

---

**User Response: Text**

I walk my dogs daily over the golf course and the wildlife is beautiful, and am sure this would be ruined if this went ahead.

Trees would be cut down that houses many Bats in the area proposed, of which these are protected at all times.

Please listen to people who live nearby and not what this council is proposing.

The new plan should delivery a cross section of housing and business centres to meet the traditions of the local areas. It should encourage the use and development of green energy, water conservation and safeguarding the environment.

There is a naive belief that vehicle traffic will decrease. There is no evidence that this will be the case. New developments and local plans fail to take into account parking needs and the building of new infrastructure.

It is a balance between modern requirements of energy efficiency and building methods and protecting green space and wildlife

To protect areas that could easily be lost

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

I think that it is important that future housing growth within the Borough is located close to facilities and services such as schools, doctor's surgeries etc. in order to encourage active travelling. Attention should also be focussed on cycle paths/lanes and footpaths and how they can be accommodated if not already in place. Sadly we must accept that people are intrinsically lazy and it will take a lot of persuasion to get people out of their cars - we must make it easy and enjoyable.

There is an acute need in the area for first time homes.

Parking has to be adequate, there are already too many areas where there is insufficient off-road parking, despite the desire to get people out of their cars the Borough Council needs to accept that many homes will continue to have at least one car if not 2 over the lifetime of this Plan.

I am also keen that the Borough Council considers the need for new developments to be Net Zero and not have harmful impacts on the natural environment. Hence the need to consider energy efficiency and protecting biodiversity and ecology.

---

### User Response: Text

As a Shipbourne resident, it is with great disappointment I read three potential sites are being considered for our small village, nestled in a Conservation Area, Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, three layers of protection which should be enough to discourage the Council to develop houses here. It seems not.

Therefore I detail below why I object to sites 59779, 59825 and 59827 being considered for development:

Site 59779:

- This site is in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, on the edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. If this site were to be developed, it 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.
- The access onto Back lane is in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school. As a parent whose children attend Shipbourne Primary, Back Lane becomes extremely congested already at drop off and pick up times and would not cope with extra housing.
- There is a dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227, any extra traffic so close to a school with very young children would make it implausible.
- There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.

Site 59825:

- This site is in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, on the edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. If this site were to be developed, it 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.
- This is a very open site.
- The access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane is narrow and dangerous.
- The proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne.

Site 59827:

- This site is in the Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, on the edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. If this site were to be developed, it 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.
- There are land drainage issues on this site and a watercourse runs along the southern boundary.

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. 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.

---

**User Response: Text**

There are (only) 34 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty in this country which include The Surrey Hills, The Wye Valley, the Isles of Scilly and the Kent Downs where Shipbourne lies. As AONB, it is all of our responsibility to protect the land, conserve and enhance its natural beauty. It goes without saying that building houses in this area is in total contradiction with protecting and preserving the land, with the three proposed sites for Shipbourne (in the New Local Plan) totalling over 120 houses, therefore almost doubling the current amount of dwellings in this tiny village. That is obviously quite outrageous and the communities that live in this area will strongly object to this beautiful part of the country being spoilt and changed forever. TMBC needs to acknowledge the fact that their housing target is completely unrealistic, seeing that most of Tonbridge and Malling lies within the Green Belt, Conservation Area and part of it within AONB.

More to the point, what is TMBC's strategy towards climate change? What are you doing to preserve our green spaces for generations to come, and the habitats and biodiversity that form those green spaces? What commitments have you made to protect and enhance Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, of which only 34 exist in the whole country? Where in your Climate Change Action Plan have you listed your commitment to protecting these spaces, knowing full well that development would have a significant impact?

Most importantly, how can you align your strategy to address the climate crisis with your housing strategy? At present they are in complete contradiction with each other. Moving the boundaries of the Green Belt, building in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as Conservation Areas is supremely short-sighted when we are living through a climate crisis that is affecting every living thing on this planet and is ultimately the biggest threat to us as humans.

It is extremely disappointing to see that none of this features in your Climate Change Action Plans, which seem to be copied and pasted year on year. Your plans should be promoting the acceptance of science that we are in a climate emergency, taking both mitigation and adaptation elements (you mention this but there is no evidence that you have taken action), protecting our beautiful part of the country, wildlife and habitat, all of which results in community wellbeing, eco-tourism and economy.

Sadly the lack of leadership in climate change is self-evident in the Local Plan and the documents you have produced to justify the building of 15,000 homes.

Cheaper housing must be made available for young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation.

Cars are not going away for a long time and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have



---

**User Response: Text**

completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Again, all of which are important for residents and the environment.

We need affordable homes to rent and buy.

They are all important to me because they are things that I need to live a well balanced, less stressed and happy lifestyle.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

I just pray that we don't get to this point and the the Local Plan is thrown out.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

To provide a nice green environment to live in.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first-time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

These are the priorities in our village.

Housing in the UK is already small. Minimum space standards would ensure that all built housing is desirable and fit for purpose and that building small inappropriate housing is not a factor in development. This should also

---

**User Response: Text**

look to ensure that houses are not stacked too closely together and that gardens are of sufficient size. Thus maximum density standards on build plots and minimum room sizes will go hand in hand to ensure that housing stock is of the highest quality.

Parking will always be a requirement as rural areas are not well served by public transport and cars will continue to be a necessity. Environmentally this should not be seen as an issue as the switch to electric environmentally friendly cars is already happening at pace thus air quality will most likely improve even if the number of cars increases.

Public open space is highly desirable and the example set by the Victorian town planners is a sound one where fresh air and access to green spaces were readily available. This is good for mental health, the natural environment and is highly desirable.

Self-build is crucial to allow for people to build the houses they want to live in as opposed to forcing people only into the houses that are available. This is likely to result in desirable houses of interesting construction being built as opposed to cookie cutter boxes which are often dull and unpleasant. For many, building one's own house is an aspiration, and anything the local authority can do to help encourage this would be very positive.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

I believe we are lacking in the requirements I selected

Not enough of these community based projects in this area.

Affordable housing appropriately sized for young and old

Road and parking infrastructure

---

**User Response: Text**

my priorities would be to have enough houses and to ensure we look after the planet.

All are very important, there are probably others. Design rules which result in inappropriate solutions, such as providing car barns because they count as parking spaces, where people need security for their cars and bicycles and garden equipment is not being taken into consideration, resulting in potential for huge increased in crime.

Once again limiting choice seems inappropriate. All are very important and there are probably others that could be suggested.

Safety and security are becoming an increasing issue due to poor design rules with the existing building developments.

As stated throughout I believe that the retention and creation of green spaces helps to promote improved physical and mental wellbeing. It is also important to blend development focus so as to appropriately provide opportunities for the young, as they move into the housing market as well as meeting the needs of an aging population and recognising the appropriately increasing focus on the needs of the disabled. Water efficiency also serve top alleviate an ever-increasing issue as we seek to distribute a scarce resource in an ever-warming climate.

Impossible to choose only 5 as I believe all are of equal importance.

See answers to previous questions.

The four sites, below should not be developed on because: development is outside the village boundary; there are no GP facilities in the village vicinity, so the assessment of sites completed is incorrect; development would be in the greenbelt, is greenfield and is top grade agricultural land; sites have been previously refused planning applications; sites were not submitted as part of the previous local plan as were not viable and, they are close to conservation areas.

- 59645 - ME19 6RE piece of land by oast houses
- 59699 - ME19 6NN large site, field from Offham Road to Fartherwell Road
- 59714 - ME19 6RD Churchfields site previously in local plan
- 59716 - ME19 6RF paddocks from Offham Road to St Leonard's Tower

All the above policy requirements are worthy and the ones I chose represent my priorities.

TMBC, together with Kent's other regions, have an unique role in shaping the future of this county. Planning rules and regulations are not there to slow down projects or even stop them. They are there to not just protect the

---

**User Response: Text**

environment, such as areas of MGB, AONBs, SSSIs, air pollution and against climate change, but also to safeguard the health and well-being of residents who may be subject to future development projects.

Affordable housing to return - borough needs more affordable homes, particularly for frontline public staff.

Energy efficiency - will help deal with cost of living and improve environment.

Water efficiency - key consideration in such a dry part of the country. will help promote biodiversity

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.  
Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!  
Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

aging population and desire to create homes for all people.

Any new houses we need to build should be built to reduce energy consumption to mitigate climate change. We also need affordable housing for our children.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Green spaces including farms and rural spaces need to remain untouched by developers and the council should reject central governments and developer pressure. As I feel it's all about making high profits and not about helping people with housing needs. Mass building has a big carbon footprint and there are already future problems reported on energy ie; gas, electric, water etc. Big developments will increase this problem. Also producing our own food is more sustainable and is more essential than over population in Tonbridge.

Central government needs to get a grip on reality and Tonbridge council should be more outspoken when defending the rights and lifestyle of people in Tonbridge.

These factors are important to me

Young people need a first home that is energy efficient to counteract the current crisis and help them cope

---

**User Response: Text**

financially. Folk with special needs deserve the chance of independent living. Our aging population needs support and assistance to cope with dignity. Please look upon an on-site car parking space as an essential with any new build properties.

Cheaper efficient housing must be made available to the younger generation and first time buyers. Make the environment more pleasant for everyone with open spaces, biodiversity and ecology

Affordable housing (buy and rent) should be available for first timers. Parking will always be needed - cars will never disappear! Public open spaces an absolute necessity for health and well-being of all citizens.

To give access to first time buyers and those on lower incomes a chance to live in their own homes and to minimise energy and water costs for everyone.

Many of the priorities are important and if given more options to choose would have been on the list but in summary, affordable housing and energy efficient houses should be prioritised. Equally, a stock of sufficient specialist or adapted housing is needed for elderly, special needs and disabled people who are less able to look after themselves.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Older residents may not wish to relocate to specialist accommodation, but would consider downsizing, thus freeing larger properties to the buying market.

Whole plot consideration is needed, providing parking for the appropriate size of house, as most families have more than one vehicle these days.

Affordable housing must be built in the vernacular. Do not build excessively designed houses. Provide limited exterior/street lighting. Protect our dark skies and cut electricity use. No panelled fencing preventing wildlife corridors or gated communities that are a cause of breakdown in the community and do not promote neighbourliness. They offer nothing to the community or local area.

Once again I cite Poundbury in Dorset as a good example of sustainable and attractive housing

---

**User Response: Text**

OTHER: Smaller houses or flats to enable older, FIT citizens to downsize as well as being suitable for younger people. This will free up larger properties within the housing stock.

Need to tackle the difficulty for first-time buyers to get onto the property ladder.

Energy is a major issue

- We should be empowering people to build the homes they want to live in.
- Biodiversity will help the natural environment and assist in fighting climate change. Green public spaces such as squares and parks are important to add to this mix.
- We used to have Parker Morris Internal Space minimum standards, these should return so that only good housing is constructed.

As per question 47 I think these answers should be ranked as they are all important in their own way.

These all help with making our local areas a nicer place to be and to help with our environment, helping with the planet.

Sustainability

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

The parking allowance for planning is totally out of date. The majority of households have at least 2 cars, usually more in rural areas. Developments need to be better designed to allow parking in front of properties without restricting the width of the road and pavement. Additional parking requirement should be implemented on medium and large scale developments.

Ensuring renewables will help with the environment as well as cost of living issues.

Unless safety is built in, any development is at risk of becoming targeted

By ensuring access to open space will help address well-being needs, increase community and mitigate the risk of building dormitory developments.

---

**User Response: Text**

As above.

It comes down to needing to find sustainable energy efficient ways to live - that will include housing and infrastructure but our climate-neutral approach to our natural resources - water and energy - must be at the heart of this.

Preservation of rural areas for the enjoyment of people but also to encourage and sustain our endangered wildlife, fauna and flora.

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 congestion at pick up and drop off times.

Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227

Bus stop on A227 currently on for school service.

There is an active covenant on this landd restricting development it is therefore un deliverable,

Site 59825

Green Belt Kent Downs AONB within the Shipbourne conservation Area

Very open site.

Dangerous acces 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

Site 59827

Green Belt Kent Downs AONB and the edge of the conservation area

Ther are land drainage problems on this site and a watercourse runs along the Belt southern boundary

Ther are already issues with sewer overflow across the site.

Common to all 3 Sites.

All 3 sites are in the Green Beltand the Kent Downs Aonb. If any of these sites were developed they would be in

---

**User Response: Text**

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 3 are unsustainable and undeliverable unless huge changes are made to the current policies covering conservation and

enhancement of this AONB village. 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, already over-subscribed.

The junctions at both ends of Back Lane and Back Lane experience speeding traffic since this road is a cut through to the A228/A26

and 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 developments.

Sewage is also under pressure and overflows are already experienced as mentioned on site 59827.

The value of all existing houses in the village will be reduced because the AONB will not be applicable.

All of the above meets the needs of the village of Burham

Overall, our objective in answering the questions in the way we have, is to try and make certain the borough evolves naturally, rather than being subjected to contrived, massive developments. These cause an artificially unacceptable ruination of the local character and environment, which will be permanently destroyed for future generations.



---

**User Response: Text**

as above

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

These are the priorities in our village. Air quality should also be considered

These priorities are relevant to the whole country not just the Local Plan.

Trying to maintain a balance between the need for housing and the need to keep the rural aspects of the land especially near to the green belt.

See above.

These measures are long over due. Stop all building now until such time as all developing at this time adheres to these important forward thinking plans.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase

---

**User Response: Text**

their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Instead of building piecemeal as seems to be the case most of the time, we should consider building small towns in the countryside when they would have all the infrastructure they need in way of transport, roads, schools, health services, shops etc right from the start and not rely on existing services nearby which, in the case of doctors' surgeries, are oversubscribed. Development should be undertaken for the benefit of the community, and not solely for the benefit of developers' shareholders as often seems to be the case. We need housing that is affordable with a good spread of single storey houses for the elderly. The current energy crisis will hopefully become less severe when the global situation settles down, but the days of cheap energy are over. Every effort should be made to ensure all new housing stock meets, and where possible exceeds, current energy saving regulations and the opportunity to provide housing with EV cells and/or ground source heat pumps promoted during the build stage and not left as an add on. I think water efficiency is necessary if only because we have to pay for what we consume, but the main thing we need to do is get the water companies to serve the communities more than their shareholders and fix the leaks in their systems. Parking provision needs to be amended to meet the needs of modern families, especially those in rural areas where the motor car is not a luxury item but an essential part of their lives.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.

Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Because they are the things people seem to need to provide them with a decent place to live. The energy efficiency is for the environment as well as the people.

Quality of life is important. Throwing up houses won't cut it. People need to be able to park their cars, not stare into other peoples' windows when they look out of their own, be surrounded by trees, fields, fresh air, birds.

Creating over 1000 homes in any one site makes the above almost impossible. Why not 50 extra homes in each

---

**User Response: Text**

area/village? 75 even? That's more than doable. Local residents wouldn't feel so threatened, so potentially swamped, or so worried that the charming places that they have chosen to live and spend their money, where they have put down roots, learnt the local history and discovered its country walks and hidden paths, won't be swallowed whole by vast new developments that reach so far they touch the next village over. How could any local resident of a small, rural village ever be expected to agree to such a proposal, and how can any council that is supposed to speak for them, and to whom they pay their tax, ever expect them to do so?

Those waiting to get on the property ladder need help affording homes already on the market. Homes that they should be able to afford. They need help with mortgages and proving they are capable of paying them back. New homes will not fix those problems and will only upset those already in smaller villages, larger villages, and indeed, in any of the proposed areas.

New developments can be lovely. But in this case, would be putting a sticking plaster over a range of buyer issues that would not be remotely solved.

I support in part the Hadlow Parish Councils view for the future and whilst there may be a case for a few new houses each year we should not use our valuable resource of agricultural/greenbelt lands . Focus on the responses to Q2 & Q7&8 please.

Do not understand why some sites have planning before this Local Plan has been put forward and approved ( ie Carpenters Lane 59410 )

Think Council should have made all aware of what is happening ..... via email as you have 95% of every households address. Think return date for responses should be extended based on numbers at Team Meeting on 24th October ( well run but short on numbers)

Trust no planning applications will be considered on sites listed till plan has received final approvals.

Maintain biodiversity, enable people currently priced out of the area to live and work here

Cheaper, affordable housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Not all older residents want to move into special accommodation i.e. retirement villages.

Cars may change from petrol to electric but they will still be used and many recent developments have failed to allow for this. This will only result in on-street parking, causing more congestion.

They are the five most important in my personal view - though others are also worthwhile.

no response

Have already made points through in my responses

---

**User Response: Text**

Cheaper housing for older citizens who do not want to move into special accommodation.

My objective is to provide housing as needed and to improve the environment heading towards Net Zero. In addition to remove traffic as much as possible.

It is difficult to prioritize but all options are important, these appear to make the most sense.

Try to locate as many new houses in sustainable locations where residents can leave behind their cars and walk or cycle to their destination. This means new houses should be concentrated as closely as possible to these target destinations, but that this sustainable zone can be extended if suitable car free cycle tracks and pedestrian networks are introduced.

Basic minimum internal space standards need to be exceeded for all developments to ensure satisfactory levels of accommodation but this needs to be in line with national standards and not overly dictatorial so as not to be challenged or restrictive on development levels required to achieve the borough targets. It should be a safeguarding back stop to ensure satisfactory living, and be applied even where permitted development rights are imposed. If it becomes a new dwelling it has to achieve these basic requirements.

Sadly parking is an unavoidable issue. It is very difficult to live in this borough without a car. Housing needs to be concentrated in the few town centre and station locations where car free living is viable, but in all other locations adequate parking provision is required. All dwellings need at least 1 parking bay, if only to recharge an electric vehicle.

Energy subsidy and generation is going to be key for energy security and affordability. We need developments that access affordable low carbon energy and currently this is by domestic heat pumps and PV panels. This will become even more critical as the electric car usage makes current grid capacity inadequate and additional capacity and distribution should be a priority in the plan as well as data and wifi. Local and district power generation using low carbon or no carbon solutions, should be encouraged, wherever local conditions allow.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Again all of these are Good Things in themselves. My answer can only be largely based on my own personal situation without considering the greater good -- with the exception of my concern for the less well off in the borough being unable to afford housing.

We should all feel safe where we live but I currently do not. We need more local police patrols as visibility is key. Not just sitting in patrol cars on motorways trying to catch speeding motorists. Public open spaces are essential for our health and well-being and energy efficiency is the future

---

**User Response: Text**

Any housing built should strive to mitigate Climate change

Can't pick just up to 5

These things are important to us personally at the moment but of course our priorities and needs could change. However we believe that if we don't collectively concentrate our efforts into protecting our habitat and natural resources and also find ways of becoming selfsufficient for our energy this Local Plan will have little meaning by 2040. Tonbridge and Malling is an area that is already naturally disposed to help with conservation against climate change as long as we don't allow it to be over run by inappropriate development.

Better air quality to look after the people in our village

They are core to the uniqueness of Kings Hill. It's been sold on its merits as a green space, connected to nature, offering a healthy lifestyle balance. You are proposing taking this away. Therefore, you are not proposing a new development of dwellings; you are proposing the reclassification of what was meant to be a village. Also, parking is already totally out of control in Kings Hill on multiple roads and building within the existing parameters will only make this many times worse.

By 2040 a large proportion of the population will be elderly. This needs to be addressed- and not all in flats. Homes for people to buy , renting only benefits developers/landlords, but these homes should not be poky with minimal space. All homes to have solar panelled roofs and grey water capture and plant trees.

representative of the local area and to maintain the countryside and reduce impact burden on the local environment

These are priorities in our village. We would also suggest air quality

No response

Green belt land should be kept as green belt land

some of these questions are ridiculous and difficult to understand

Mostly covered by previous answers

---

**User Response: Text**

All local policy requirements are important. It's not appropriate to pick and choose between alternatives.

Air quality

I believe that every new build should have solar panels to assist with energy usage for that building and they should be energy efficient.

I am concerned that with all the building that is taking place in the South of England, we are increasing the load on the roads which threatens wildlife. Also we are getting rid of woodland/green areas/farmland that are home to various insects/birds and other animals. We need to be sure that we are maintaining habitat for them.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Climate and sustainability.

OTHER: Smaller houses or flats to enable older, FIT citizens to downsize as well as being suitable for younger people. This will free up larger properties within the housing stock.

New houses must be Climate Change proofed - built sustainably to be sustainable

We must focus on food security; stop building on farm land and stop building on Green Belt

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Site 59424 DEFRA forest inventory, ancient woodland TPOprotected trees, wildlife, over development with

---

**User Response: Text**

inadequate resources on kings hill

Site 59531 & Site 59534

Change of character of the area, traffic impact, loss of public open space

Site 59544

Harm to conservation and significant historical non listed landmarks, preservation order

Site 59547 loss of open space, harm to conservation area, increased traffic in an area struggling

Site 59630 proposed green belt harm to aquifer for streams, area of outstanding beauty, traffic restricted on local roads ..this site has had an appeal and lost in 2020

Site 59797 & 59800 harm to conservation area, green belt traffic issues

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers . Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent have developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

It is a great shame that Kent is having to endure these problems with their local council and rough riding over their residents who were born and bred here and chose to stay! The garden of England doesn't deserve this treatment and neither does it's residents! Ref no56759, 56760 59595 specifically and the others that fall into the Mereworth area!

active travel keeps use of cars down also more and smaller mass transit

energy efficiency keeps cost,of living down better for environment

public space tis strongly applies to where there are larger developments

Energy efficiency is obvious considering we are talking of power cuts this winter.

Access to affordable housing is essential but private rental only artificially inflates rental cost. Bigger local government needs to provide affordable housing to buy and rent.

Beautiful countryside and access to it is what makes this country. Also assists in the mental welfare of residents.

We need to prioritise the natural environment and minimise impact on climate change.

---

**User Response: Text**

Active travel - to reduce the congestion on the roads and encourage an active lifestyle.

Affordable housing to buy - will help first time buyers and allow people born in Tonbridge to stay in the area instead of having to move to cheaper towns.

Indoor recreational facilities- give everyone some where to meet/relax especially over the colder months. Will reduce anti social behaviour and bring revenue.

Parking - lots of cars now park on the pavements reducing safe walking spaces for pedestrians. Town centre parking is expensive.

Other - to move forward effectively all of the options need to be included and considered.

We need more smaller affordable homes for first time young buyers & older downsizers. Energy efficiency and the environment are a top priority & go hand in hand. We need to protect our local open spaces for physical & mental health of the population.

Climate and our use of resources has to become our focal point in all we do. We have to plan, develop and build in a more sustainable and environmentally conscious way to protect the future of the natural world and ultimately our future.

no comment

Housing needs combined with environmental protection.

Affordable housing to rent or buy - housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency - cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Parking and public spaces are equally important enabling space for increasing ones mental health and well being.



---

**User Response: Text**

This represents what the Tonbridge Borough is about

it is not about mass developments and infrastructure .... It is about open spaces, biodiversity, and a generally nice and not overdeveloped place to live

hopefully this is recognised

All new homes should be sustainable and use green technologies so they don't rely on the grid. They must not deplete rivers for water use or pollute . Rain water capture and use of grey water should be a requirement.

Biodiversity & Ecology - greenbelt area is valuable and needs to be protected

Energy efficiency - to reduce carbon emissions

Modern Methods of Construction - to ensure that new builds are thermally efficient and use less natural resources

Public open space - for health, wellbeing and quality of life, particularly if green open space

Renewable energy generation (eg photovoltaic cells) - to reduce carbon emissions, reliance on other countries / energy security

Cheaper, well built, energy efficient housing must be the norm. First time buyers need to be catered for and it should be recognised that older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation but would like the opportunity to downsize to smaller independent accommodation.

Prices within the housing market will always be determined by supply and demand. Smaller houses are required for local first time buyers and the grammar schools should change their admissions policies to provide priority to local youngsters to avoid so many people moving into the area from south London (where grammar schools have to be paid for) to the correct postcode for entry to free grammar schools.

These are specific to Hadlow where I live.

---

**User Response: Text**

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Houses need to be carbon neutral and fitted with the latest technology. Keeping green spaces helps carbon neutral.

don't consider many of the options relevant to issues of viability for the Local Plan. Several options are either a requirement under planning regulation or under building regulation and therefore irrelevant for plan making. Climate change should be the top priority in all aspects of planning development expansion

Mitigation of climate change and retention of the natural environment.

Better air quality to look after the people in our village.

Better air quality to look after the people in our village

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!  
Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

They mean the most to me

I live in Kings Hill and I am very concerned that the character of the 'Garden Village' is going to be destroyed if the proposals in this plan go ahead. It will simply be absorbed into the Medway Gap urban sprawl.

Kings Hill is not an urban site – it does not have the amenities, medical services, transport network (reduced bus service for example), to be a urban centre.

Plus – I am very concerned that access to green space will not be kept if the Green belt status is not retained. We all need access to green space for mental and physical needs, and a green boundary gives Kings Hill guaranteed access and defines it from other areas.

I have lived in Kings Hill for 14 years, I cannot think of a time where there has not been the threat of more housing. Two years ago I spoke at the Planning Enquiry into Amber Lane – a situation that took a tremendous

---

**User Response: Text**

amount of time and money, and yet I see the site proposed in the plan. It leaves me little hope for the future.

It is only through the efforts of local communities that action against such plans is made but we have jobs, families and lives to live, and not all of us have the time to complete lengthy questionnaires. And I for one am so tired of this constant pressure at Kings Hill that we plan to move away in the next 12 months

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move to special accommodation. Cars are not going away for a long time and some recent developments have failed to provide sufficient parking as a result surrounding streets have become busy with parked vehicles from new developments. People will always want to move to areas where there are renowned schools therefore putting prices up and creating more population in these areas. Many people from out of the local area move to Tonbridge for this reason only, sometimes renting out their own properties in London areas while their children are at school here. This will not change until the grammar schools revise their application process. Market conditions will dictate the cost of housing in any area despite Council's best intentions.

These should be the priorities in the whole borough to keep it a pleasant place to live for all and addressing our impact on the environment to ensure it remains for future generations.

These are fundamental issues which should be addressed when making decisions about any new development.

There are not really relevant to the Local Plan, but are Geo-critical issues that should be in people's minds when making ALL decisions.

We support local planning policy requirements that are aimed at regeneration of existing urban areas (such as Tonbridge Town Centre & other conurbations through bringing together affordable housing/occupants with good transport link, retail & local amenities to limit pollution, costs & not remove green belt thereby helping with sustainability & protect against climate change.

Smaller adjacent villages should not be subject to anti-convolescence maintaining identity between settlements.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!  
Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

---

**User Response: Text**

We have the opportunity to make a difference to the future of our borough and future generations.

Always consider the impact of our actions on the environment and biodiversity.

Affordable Housing to Buy – It is widely recognised that once on the property ladder mortgage payments are less than rental prices. Home ownership also supports the culture of long term employment which supports our economy. Housing prices continue to rise reducing the potential for many to own homes. Affordable housing is desperately needed for purchase as well as rent.

Parking - Homes should have sufficient parking for the households needs to reduce the obstruction caused by on street parking. Accepting that use of private transport cannot always be avoided - see earlier answers.

Open Space - This is more than desirable for recreation and aesthetics as well as encouraging nature and biodiversity.

Safety & Security - all homes should be secure and in a safe environment. Building plans should be approved as "Secured by Design". This will support communities and encourage people to move around on foot rather than by car.

Sustainable drainage - Flooding both fluvial and flash flooding are an issue in Tonbridge. With increased pressure on water demands, it seems prudent to design in water retention or reuse systems.

Adaptability of housing seems more sensible than specific residential use. Rural needs biodiversity, development often restricts/ruins it. Water is a national issue. Lack of policing and crime rates increasing needs careful planning in development. Parking is important to alleviate on street parking which is dangerous and causes congestion. Energy efficiency at build point is sensible.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

---

**User Response: Text**

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it ends its way into the environment.

Health and Wellbeing

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it ends its way into the environment.

these choices all help to make for better places to live.

Because these are the most important to me

In the past we have built properties with no regard to energy sources and it is quite obvious from recent crisis that we need to be conserving energy and water. The only way that we can conserve these energies is to produce our own heating and lighting, and finding ways of utilising our own rainfall to offset the rainfall that is not going into our reservoirs due to the building of houses and the appropriate roads and hard-standing.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first-time buyers.

Older citizens do not want to move into special accommodation.

Cars are not going away for a long time and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Quality of life and reduced energy consumption

---

**User Response: Text**

To make sure TNBC areas are Cleaner, more energy efficient with limited development making it pleasant area to live in.

Sustainable development in simple terms. We must build for the future security of our population. Short cuts to deliver cheap, poor quality housing and commercial buildings is unacceptable. Renewable energy, water conservation, grey water systems, flood prevention, insulation are absolute key elements that have to form part of every new building whether a single property or a major development - no exceptions. No planning permission should be granted UNLESS all possible and relevant green systems and methods are incorporated from day 1 and are present upon completion. We cannot delay in this undertaking, we must act now for future generations.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

The environment is a priority but we need young people to be able to buy houses, locally.

No point in building homes that local people cannot afford to live in.  
High quality modern homes that are cost effective to use.  
Must have good access to the green environment.

Cheaper housing must be available for the young , first time buyers and not all senior citizens dream of living in special accommodation . The problem of cars has not been addressed in many recent developments either through cost or lack of space resulting in additional cars ending up parked in local streets annoying existing residents as fewer spaces become available .

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it Snds its way into the environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

To address the two greatest threats to our society at large and our local community. To ensure that TMBC is able to manage the greater threats to our homes, urban areas, rural spaces and lives.

No response

As a recent first time buyer, I know how hard it is to buy in this area, so we do have a need for first time buyers housing, which are a good size and have good energy efficiency.

I have selected these particular requirements as I feel they are key priorities for the area and the wider community. Biodiversity and ecology is key for climate change. Open space is key for mental health, health in general, ecology and biodiversity.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and their finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and businesses to preserve their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its

---

**User Response: Text**

way into the environment.

Looking after our resources (energy, water and land) is of prime importance if we want to live sustainably.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

preserve the environment

preserve environment - limit water and water usage.

The items I have chosen are to ensure that the new houses are affordable, as that is where the current construction activity is failing miserably. They also need to be cheap to run, hence the renewable energy and energy efficiency of each house. Finally all houses should be accessible to all people.

Simply because it will negatively impact upon my well being. So therefore in particular I strongly object to any development on the field at Site 59770. Our lane is historic and narrow and it would therefore be an inappropriate increase in traffic should any development occur on the field. This field is currently being occupied by sheep and is therefore managed really very well, and thus creates a positive environment for us who live here. Kind regards  
Dr Camilla Sagemo

We need affordable houses for local people, including accommodation for the elderly, rather than the Borough act as a sink hole for London Commuters from all over the country. People will come to the Borough irrespective of whether they live here or not if the Borough is made attractive enough. This must include the provision of Greenbelt for biodiversity, which is so important as well as the wellbeing of locals in such things as local walks and open spaces. In land liable to flood, which is a great deal of land around the many rivers in the area, sustainable drainage and anti-pollution measures should be in force.



---

**User Response: Text**

see response to Q2 above

I am a resident of Shipbourne and cannot comment on other sites. I strongly object to all the 3 sites put forward for housing in Shipbourne because they are all on designated areas of AOB. As such the 3 sites are legally protected by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act). It protects the land to conserve and enhance its natural beauty.

Please refer previous comments, thank you.

Self-explanatory.

We need more affordable housing and we need open spaces and a natural environment that make communities pleasant places to live.

This survey has been designed to confuse the public. Most people will give up before completing the survey. This means that the Council can do whatever it wants while claiming they have consulted the public. As a public elected body shame on you.

I think they are all important but i think the ones highlighted are the important ones

There is no white space so additional comment on the sites proposed here.

Sites 59813, 59639, 59640,59753 and 59782. Unsuitable for development. Poor accessibility, site is inn flood zone 2 and 3. Roads to the site flood. Site 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. Site is on greenbelt land. 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. Additionally the CLH fuel pipeline goes through this site. 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.

Being environmentally aware in both construction and future use of development is essential for the future

Due to inflation and energy prices increasing houses need to be as energy efficient as possible, there should be efficient water supplies and more implementing of water butts at sites to save water. Parking is awful at new build sites, if councils were only able to see the complaints residents make every single day and this is due to their not

---

**User Response: Text**

being enough spaces again as stated before most homes have more than 1 car therefore there needs to be an increase of at least 2 spaces per property including flats and increase in visitor parking, an additional 4 parking bays is not enough for 30 houses. Houses are not affordable and therefore more and more people are struggling to get onto the housing market. People need green spaces nearby for them to stay positive and have strong mental health to build the resilience of a community.

I already explained my attitude to climate change under Q48. It may or may not happen to any great degree.

Lack of parking and road congestion is a daily problem for most people in the north east and east of the borough. This burden needs to be spread around.

Everyone wants a safe and secure home, especially when we have so many people of uncertain origin and intention arriving on the coast of Kent every day, not far from T&MB.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

It is important the area is true to the roots of country/town/village living rather than feeling like city living.

It cannot be underestimated that our future will be different and the requirements of better more efficient homes in low carbon construction will be better for the environment and individuals who inhabit them. Greater ability to safe cycle and walk to places will encourage healthier lifestyles and encourage people not to use their cars as much. Open green spaces for recreational and leisure - not to mention assist in promoting better mental health.

These are personal options for someone in their 70's. I'm sure that they would have been quite different 30 or 40 years ago.

I strongly object to the inclusion of these three sites in the plan.

Site 59779

- This land is on the green belt and the Kent AONB, it is also on the edge of the Shipbourne Conservation area

There is poor drainage to the southern boundary

Access onto BackLand is very close to Shipbourne Primary school and so increases the risks to the children and parents using that site. This is already a high traffic area and there is congestion at rush times.

- There is an active covenant on this land restricting it's use

Site 59827

- This land is also on the green belt and Kent AONB, and on the edge of the conservation area

- there are land drainage issues on the site and often issues of sewage overflow issues across the site

Site 59825

---

**User Response: Text**

- again this is green belt and AONB and on the edge of the Shipbourne conservation area  
The area off Back Lane and Upper Green Road are small country lanes that are already dangerous and speeding traffic, additional residential development would exacerbate this

There is much more to do, and we all need to use climate change and sustainability as a priority, using resources that are free - sun, wind, rain, more use of turbines in fast flowing waters

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staR who serve their community.

Energy EUciency – Cutting consumption is going to beneSt everyone in terms of the environment and Snances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their proSt margins and thrive.

Water EUciency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it Snds its way into the environment.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

The reasons that the following sites are deemed unsuitable for development are as follows:

**Site 59779:**

- Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB on the edge of the 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, which includes heavy farm traffic and lorries already passing - this would be hugely exacerbated by the proposed developments. My children attend Shipbourne

---

**User Response: Text**

School, and the traffic noise and pollution from the A227 is already excessive. Three dangerous accidents near the school in the last 12 months given the volume and speed of traffic.

- 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, and within the Shipbourne Conservation Area.
- Very open site which can be seen for several miles - goes against the green belt ethos that developments should be hidden where possible.
- Issues with sewage overflow and subsidence at house opposite - this would render the site almost unworkable as an option.
- Dangerous access onto narrow Upper Green Road, or onto Back Lane. Traffic is already substantial at weekends given the community enjoying the open spaces, rural landscapes and wildlife. Several birds, foxes, badgers and rare birds can be seen on and near the common. There were in excess of 90 cars parked near the site last weekend given visitors attending from nearby Tonbridge - site and narrow roads are already overrun.
- Proposed mixed development on this site is questionable. There is no identifiable need for social housing in Shipbourne and given exposure of the site this may further impact the sensitivity of the development within the surrounding area.

**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.

**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 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 significantly oversubscribed and with capacity for only 60 children (which is already a stretch based on

---

**User Response: Text**

current buildings and facilities).

- 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.

All of these developments would therefore be extremely costly, damaging to the greenbelt and AONB, and would have a severe detrimental impact on the environment and local wildlife.

Experience in trying to find suitable accommodation for older relatives.

Preservation of natural habitat and biodiversity is essential for our society and the world.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation. Cars are not going away for a long time and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

To address climate change and ensure a sustainable future for Tonbridge and Malling

These are most important to me - I did what your question asked.

Once again, I would prefer to weight these answers. I've chosen 5 but a few more would make my list. I could than let you know what was most important to me.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul

---

**User Response: Text**

sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

losing Agricultural land and green space will lead to a lack of food and a toxic environment that will kill us all if we dont have them.

Housing can be compressed or develop different areas such as existing brownfield sites, especially looking at the many empty light industrial units in the borough.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing is primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property especially as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs to encourage front line workers who are predominantly lower paid into the area.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills; this includes cutting fuel consumption in cars by people not having to use them.

---

**User Response: Text**

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Internal space standards, these should not always default to the minimum building regulation minimum size. Any measure that is to do with coping with climate change is a top priority.

Adding to existing housing estates, causing more urban sprawl with larger houses, causing more parking problems, is not solving the problem of affordable housing for young people.

**Affordable Housing to Rent** – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

**Energy Efficiency** – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

**Water Efficiency** - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

I feel that the village of Hadlow should have enough parking for residents and for people to visit the village. I also believe that the biodiversity should be monitored and looked after and we need to improve the environment. I also feel that the village of Hadlow needs to feel safe and secure with more police presence.

See all my answers to previous questions

I have written an email which includes my objections.

Some of the measures are not relevant to the local plan, merely factors of good development and required under planning regulations.  
climate change is a current and future critical factor and should be high on the priority list.

---

## User Response: Text

SUDs and water efficiency are linked. SUDs are a requirement by drainage authorities and Environment agency. Water efficiency in the home and provision of water butts and green roofs are not and something that should be required by development management policies.

Space standards and zero carbon dwellings are fundamental issues.

All homes should be to high standards despite tenure.

These policy requirements affect everyone and are covered in some way either by Government Acts, Regulations and/or Policy.

Once high standards of building stock are required and secured the type and tenure come later and have been addressed under other questions in this questionnaire.

**The issues we are invited to prioritise are dominated by aspects of housing and omit other topics which should be policy priorities; Constraints and standards are different to what should be built to fulfil needs. For instance - Of course we need 'affordable homes' – but let's not pose the questions as an alternative to 'space standards' and 'zero carbon homes'. They are not either or. The answers should not exclude each other. The questions group wrong issues together.**

Nine of these identified 'policy requirements' are WHAT i.e.

- Accessible and adaptable housing,
- Active travel,
- Affordable housing to buy,
- Affordable housing to rent,
- First homes,
- Indoor recreation facilities,
- Parking
- Self-build and/ or custom Housebuilding,
- Specialist housing.

Nine of these 'policy requirements' are related to HOW these requirements should be built and developments be designed and what should be cared for. i.e.:

- Biodiversity and ecology,
- Energy efficiency,
- Internal space standards,
- MMC,
- Public Open Space,
- Renewable energy generation,
- Safety and security,
- SUDS,
- Water efficiency,

There are lots of other policy requirements – such as AIR QUALITY and infrastructure which have been left out.

The questions in this questionnaire have continually mixed up constraints and standards with what must be provided/developed to meet needs, therefore the analysis of this consultation response will be skewed and will not



---

**User Response: Text**

reflect what people's preferences are.

- Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change.

Consistent with answers given to other questions.

Affordability of housing is essential, especially given the pressure to provide more housing stock. Unless the housing is made accessible to more of the local growing population a paradoxical situation occurs. New development needs to be well designed, energy efficient and sustainable. Lastly, much needs to be done to improve the safety of our roads and to encourage cycling.

Biodiversity & Ecology - greenbelt area is valuable and needs to be protected

Energy efficiency - to reduce carbon emissions

Modern Methods of Construction - to ensure that new builds are thermally efficient and use fewer natural resources

Public open space - for health, wellbeing and quality of life, particularly if green open space

Renewable energy generation (eg photovoltaic cells) - to reduce carbon emissions, reliance on other countries / energy security

I have selected these particular requirements as I feel they are key priorities for the area and the wider community. Biodiversity and ecology is key for climate change. Open space is key for mental health, health in general, ecology and biodiversity.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

I have selected these particular requirements as I feel they are key priorities for the area and the wider

---

**User Response: Text**

community. Biodiversity and ecology is key for climate change. Open space is key for mental health, health in general, ecology and biodiversity.

I have selected these particular requirements as I feel they are key priorities for the area and the wider community. Biodiversity and ecology is key for climate change. Open space is key for mental health, health in general, ecology and biodiversity.

**Site 59779:**

- Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. These areas should be untouchable in the face of the climate crisis, a situation which is urgent and desperate, regardless of the housing crisis and the unrealistic housing quota the government has set. As humans, we have a responsibility to speak up when decisions from the top are fundamentally wrong.
- Poor drainage on southern boundary.
- Access onto Back lane in close proximity to main access to Shipbourne Primary school which is already a nightmare to navigate at drop off and pick up hours.
- Danger to school children and congestion at pick up and drop off times.
- Dangerous junction of Back Lane with the A227. There has already been an accident this year, just outside the school office with a car speeding down the A227
- There is an active covenant on this land restricting development. It is therefore undeliverable.

**Site 59825:**

- Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. These areas should be untouchable in the face of the climate crisis, a situation which is urgent and desperate, regardless of the housing crisis and the unrealistic housing quota the government has set. As humans, we have a responsibility to speak up when decisions from the top are fundamentally wrong.
- 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. Let's face it, these houses would be for affluent people looking to move to another area rather than for social housing. Am I right?

**Site 59827:**

- Green Belt and the Kent Downs AONB, edge of Shipbourne Conservation Area. These areas should be untouchable in the face of the climate crisis, a situation which is urgent and desperate, regardless of the housing crisis and the unrealistic housing quota the government has set. As humans, we have a responsibility to speak up when decisions from the top are fundamentally wrong.

---

## User Response: Text

- 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 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 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 A2
- 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.
- Finally... perhaps we should all stop pretending that the climate crisis doesn't affect us all and more importantly, that every decision on the climate crisis that we make in our personal and professional lives, impact us as humans on this planet. Building thousands of houses on protected green spaces is obviously going to contribute to more severe climate change. Also your appraisal reports for each site are astoundingly discreditable; your objectives 'to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity' and 'to protect and enhance the borough's landscape and townscape character and quality' by building housing in an AONB should NOT have responses like 'uncertainty exists, as appropriate mitigation may avoid adverse effects and may even result in beneficial effects' or 'the effect is uncertain as it may be possible to conserve or even enhance the asset through the design and layout of the new development'. Come again?? In actual fact, the responses to the majority of your objectives (mostly objectives 5 and beyond) are farcical. We are indeed in a crisis (a climate crisis) if local councils are demolishing, disfiguring and obliterating our beautiful countryside, and justify their strategy with questionable appraisal reports. Communities in the present and the future will remember.

1, Suitable Housing for the elderly, not necessarily flats, provides a safe environment and potentially releases

---

**User Response: Text**

family homes for use by families.

2, Active Travel cycling walking. Health and wellbeing

3, Public Open Space. Somewhere for those without gardens who live in towns and perhaps do not drive. Children's health and happiness.

4, Renewable Energy. This is a must but only affordable for the few. Should be compulsory on all new builds.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation. Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

The priorities of the local plan should be to use accurate up to date data to inform a coherent approach to development that takes into account climate change - flooding, energy efficiency; the environment - biodiversity, reducing road congestion etc; the needs of local people- skill mix, affordable living.

The planners need to focus towards Tonbridge not central government targets, this is after all a LOCAL plan

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Public open space - To enhance people's mental health - so families can play, picnic and help children's development through activity. Trees for fresher air, shade and ground water management.

Biodiversity - Our wildlife will fall to critically low level unless we maintain and enhance this in our built environments. Also, so children can learn about nature close to home.

---

**User Response: Text**

Specialist Housing - We need to have better support for the elderly in our communities. Affordable sustainable housing developments specifically aimed at meeting the needs of the elderly including communal areas for activities to enhance their mental health and their sense of worth and belonging.

Modern construction - Low carbon footprint building from sustainable materials with self generated power. Prefabricated designs that are spacious, are aesthetically pleasing and cost effective to build.

Of most importance is the impact of climate change and the destruction of the local environment. This is a bedrock upon much else rests. We must continue to preserve and enhance the environment of the borough as our biggest priority.

again - all important

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and their finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

They address my three main concerns of climate change, biodiversity and (to a lesser extent) food security

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

---

**User Response: Text**

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments. not building on green belt

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

**Affordable Housing to Rent** – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. **Energy Efficiency** – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and Finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. **Water Efficiency** - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use Swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community. Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment . Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

These are the requirements that have the most obvious and widest public benefit.

---

**User Response: Text**

I know it's not an easy task and you will never please all the applicable electorate, but essentially I would appreciate that we prioritise development of a healthy community and borough over the immediate capital recovery of the growth investment. That has been the driver of my decisions throughout. Destroying open public space and green-belt land is an easy choice to satisfy the primary objective of getting more housing stock, but it will not create a more cohesive community. Enable people to be more self-sufficient and support our local environment and the rest, I believe, will follow.

Preserving our community by building in an environmentally sustainable way

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. It will also help to preserve dwindling resources for generations to come.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority.

In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Requirement of other regulations, should not form part of local plan.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

---

**User Response: Text**

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

To enable new home owning residents of Hildenborough to live in similar dwellings in the same environment as which they grew up and continue to enjoy the village lifestyle they enjoyed as children here.

These are the requirements that have the most obvious and widest public benefit.

As a low earner with three adult children who will never afford their own house due to low wages, I worry for their future.

There are many people 'working the system' to buy more than one property. New housing must be protected from this.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

It's what I believe is required

Individuals can affect their own health through being active which over the longer term has reduced impacts on the health care services. However, the infrastructure to facilitate active living is sometimes not available. Energy provision and supply is limited and therefore being able to tap into a localised sustainable energy source would reduce our impacts on the environment significantly as a household.

Affordable Housing to buy: We are increasingly seeing new housing developments that 'seem' to include affordable housing at planning stage. However, when it comes to build stage its hard to determine where the affordability actually is. Our country is in an economic crisis with cost of living going through the roof and getting onto the housing ladder impossible.

Energy Efficiency: Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Biodiversity and open public spaces: See above responses on wellbeing of local residents and wildlife



---

**User Response: Text**

Safety and security: This relates to the safety of roads and being able to walk with young children instead of car use. Well-lit streets and a police presence should also be key. I am a member of Tonbridge Mums Facebook group and there are regular posts about youth being violent and intimidating - I no longer walk alone in Tonbridge during the evenings.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

Reasons need no further explanation, all been answered above

Quality of life

For reasons I have previously given. Our ageing population needs particular care and attention; support for carers and families who are not qualified or equipped to care for ageing relatives, but have no choice.

It's no good building housing that people cannot afford. Homes need to be energy efficient and store rain water for use in dry spells. Insufficient parking is a problem in modern developments and with more young people staying with their parents longer, there will only be more cars that need somewhere to park.

What are your reasons for selecting these particular local requirements as priorities for the Local Plan (outline briefly (max. 6000 characters))?

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Climate change and a good environment are most important things

I do not want any of the Green Belt to be taken away for the development of houses, businesses or public

---

**User Response: Text**

amenities., nor any of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to be encroached on.

I do not want any farming land to be used for housing because we will need to grow more of our own produce in the coming years, and these farm lands often abut onto the Green Belt and AONB.

Having chosen to live in a rural village setting, the building of inappropriate housing that does not fit into the character of the area is to destroy the very nature of our Kent villages which reflect the need of quiet , the need of fresh air, the need of exercise, the sight of the night sky and of bats , and the sound of owls calling. All these things define the word 'rural'.Extra lighting from more houses in Ightham and Ivy Hatch and the other villages in TMBC will destroy these things.

Mostly eco issues to mitigate against waste. Also internal living space in modern housing in the uk is often cramped and limited usage

Per capita rainfall is lower than the mediterranean, water shortages and outages will only increase as summers get hotter and drier.

Much of the farmland around Watringbury is Grade 1 agricultural land. How can the consultation allow the prospect of building on that?

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

N/a

Active travel - The future needs to be more people making their day to day journeys on foot or by bike to reduce air pollution and road congestion. Tonbridge benefits from largely flat land so with a strategic vision could be a mini Amsterdam with people cycling everywhere

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to beneSt everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their

---

### User Response: Text

profit margins and thrive.

Water efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Sustainable development in simple terms. We must build for the future

security of our population. Short cuts to deliver cheap, poor quality housing and commercial buildings is unacceptable. Renewable energy, water conservation, grey water systems, flood prevention, insulation are absolute key elements that have to form part of every new building whether a single property or a major development - no exceptions. No planning permission should be granted UNLESS all possible and relevant green systems and methods are incorporated from day 1 and are present upon completion. We cannot delay in this undertaking, we must act now for future generations.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

They all seem equally important but we feel the ones we have chosen have the edge when considering new developments given the pressures that are clearly on the long term environmental costs and current energy costs as these are not likely to change for many years.

Accessible and adaptable housing for elderly to provide an affordable downsizing option which will free up family houses. Disabled housing because we need to remain inclusive. Housing needs to be as close to carbon neutral as possible and the effect on the climate needs to be considered carefully where we are looking to reduce CO2 emissions.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual

---

**User Response: Text**

consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staR who serve their community.

Energy EUciency – Cutting consumption is going to beneSt everyone in terms of the environment and Snances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying higH energy bills, and business to increase their proSt margins and thrive.

Water efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it Snds its way into the environment.

Support climate change as priority within local plan.

**Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change**

I live and work in the borough. These are what I am most interested in/affect me the most.

Same reasons as previously stated for other questions

The questions have been deliberately made difficult to understand and do not allow for objection in a simple form.

Cars are not going away for a long time and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.

Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments

---

### User Response: Text

have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Helping young and old in the locality to have homes and taking climate change worries seriously

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments. Need to avoid our borough coming to resemble a London borough in looks, feel and crime levels.

key requirements for a cleaner, healthier more active lifestyle whilst retaining the village feel character and aesthetic.

Overall comments:

I wanted to be able to comment on the particular sites below, but this questionnaire did not allow me to do so. The Local Plan documentation is highly complicated and I have struggled to navigate my way around, even with the support of Friends of Offham Road. Please you take my views below into consideration:

- 59645 - ME19 6RE piece of land by oast houses
- 59699 - ME19 6NN large site, field from Offham Road to Fartherwell Road
- 59714 - ME19 6RD Churchfields site previously in local plan

---

**User Response: Text**

- 59716 - ME19 6RF paddocks from Offham Road to St Leonard's Tower

I would like to challenge the development of the sites above for the following reasons:

- 1) development is outside the village boundary
- 2) there are no GP facilities in the village vicinity, so the assessment of sites completed is incorrect
- 3) development would be in the greenbelt, is greenfield and is top grade agricultural land
- 4) sites have been previously refused planning applications
- 5) sites were not submitted as part of the previous local plan as were not viable
- 6) they are all close to conservation areas

In the past, we have built houses with no regard to energy saving. It is quite obvious from recent events that we should be conserving energy and water. The only way is to conserve these energies is to produce our own and utilise ways of saving rainfall to offset the rain that is not going into our reservoirs but going straight into rivers due to developments which restrict soak up within the natural environment and does not replenish the water table.

See response to Q2

You cannot build on greenbelt, it's greenbelt for a reason. You can't just change the rules on it just so it can be built on, new houses won't bring any benefits to the community in Hildenborough it will only take away for the village life, re development Tonbridge instead built on unused spaces there isn't, greenbelt is only being used because its cheaper to do. Keep our green spaces rather than greed of housing developers!!

They will be the difference between success or failure of this plan.

Best for the environment and real local housing need as opposed to Nationally assessed targets

When you are surrounded by beautiful Kent Countryside, why wouldn't you wish to fight to save it?

To reduce the impact on the environment we need to build less, what we do build should use MMC and be as passive and green is design as possible, where building is necessary add a green roof, water butts etc to make it as green as possible to make up for the loss in space and green space

---

**User Response: Text**

Create a sustainable community for all residents.

It is essential that urban and brownfield sites are developed where possible, as this will readily enable integration with existing infrastructure and amenities and will minimise impacts on transport systems, whilst protecting the rural environment and biodiversity for everyone to enjoy.

Higher density housing appropriate to these locations should optimise energy efficiency and make walking or cycling to the local facilities practical. Affordable housing for lower income groups and first-time buyers should be readily integrated.

Similar to my other answers, density and integration into the environment rather than concentrating on developing densely populated large urban areas for the creation of social and environmental problems.

It is clear we need more houses and they need to fulfil our changing society. Younger people need affordable places to live and (probably) rent, our elderly are living longer and need safe and adaptable spaces to live and enjoy. We need more schools, surgeries, cottage hospitals, cycle lanes and transport hubs - and to encourage commercial businesses to invest so there are more local work opportunities.

But...we must be environmentally aware and responsible and use new technology that allows us to build and live more sustainably. We must be mindful of not encroaching on small areas of Green Belt but instead reusing brownfield sites and allowing empty council properties to be purchased and renovated.

It seems obvious to me, after attending the Hildenborough Planning meeting with (the excellent) Matt Boughton, that the council must identify the optimum large area and copy the successful development at Kings Hill as this single, but extensive new conurbation, can provide all of the above for many years to come.

The foregoing options have been selected to enable Hildenborough Village to grow naturally and accommodate new housing residents who add to the Village nature and character.

Specialist housing including supported housing for elderly with different levels of support according to need. Bed blocking is a serious problem for the NHS and this type of accommodation frees up beds.

Climate change is a global emergency.

Affordable rented accommodation is in very short supply.

**Affordable Housing to Rent** – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing

---

**User Response: Text**

shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

**Energy Efficiency** – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

**Water Efficiency** - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it Snds its way into the environment.

Most appropriate planning with green belt preservation and sustainability with infrastructure is the utmost priority to create modern developments.

There is great local concern about the proposed developments. If they all proceed, the whole local environment will change for the worse. There is already much building in the area and the effect of the proposed huge increase in homes/population will have a catastrophic effect let alone the effect on the environment. I'm not sure how government can justify such a large number of new builds when green issues are so important. We are already under strain with the water supply. Gas and electricitiy supply nationally is causing concern. I cannot see how these huge developments are acceptable under a green policy. I fear there a many developers/land agents rubbing their hands with glee if all of the proposed developments are approved and the people who really need housing will see no benefit. PLEASE DON'T DESTROY OUR AREA.

We need to look after the disadvantaged.

No Response

Given costings there needs to be a basic requirement to make new builds as environmentally and energy efficient as possible with grants available for those home owners who can sustain and supplement improvements later on. The minimum requirement does need to be of a high standard

These five will provide the best chance of preserving our rural communities and allow local residents to enjoy them in future generation.

No response



---

**User Response: Text**

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

We need to live healthy, sustainable and affordable lives with enough space in our homes for communities to develop. The selected points I hope triangulate on this view

To keep and improve the quality of life of local residents.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

I am appalled at the developments and allocated need for housing , the South East is already far too busy with poor infrastructure and networks

The whole concept of the Local Plan is upsetting to so many people whose homes and lives are under threat The risk to Green belt and areas of natural beauty is shocking It is affecting peoples Mental Health that areas which have been previously identified and protected for nature and the climate are at risk These areas were invaluable in

---

**User Response: Text**

the recent lockdown periods To be able to walk in clean, safe , beautiful fields, woods, gardens kept people going  
It is a living nightmare that this mental health release can be taken away and ruined by building developments  
The whole process of the Local plan is long, convoluted, deliberately difficult to follow and unnecessarily complex  
There will be many people who have been put off responding because it is too arduous

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

The five policy requirements selected are fundamental in tackling the nature and climate crisis, whilst also tackling nature deprivation within local communities.

There has been no real mention of extending the existing infrastructure around Borough Green and Ightham. What about Improved roads and access to the motorway M20, which would all need to come through Wrotham Heath; this is already a bottle neck. Also, there is no specific reference to the need for additional schools, hospitals, local surgeries, drainage, water supply etc etc?

The self-build and specialist housing sectors are important components of the housing market that are presently lacking in policy support in the present plan. The delivery of these forms can further reduce pressures on the mainstream housing market.

We need greener housing built to meet requirements and not drain more existing resources.

Parking needs are never considered well and we have seen the damage of poor planning.

We need more care homes etc to encourage elderly to leave large homes to keep the market going.

We need porous drives

---

**User Response: Text**

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!  
Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

It is important that the Local Plan responds to the nature and climate crises.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staff who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

The 22 sites in the Green Belt surrounding Hildenborough that you want to develop for housing!

---

**User Response: Text**

Because they are important.

I did do a lot more detailed response but lost it! Sorry

we need to make sustainable choices for the long term

I feel strongly we have a duty as a society to look after vulnerable people. We also have an aging population so we must plan for the future regarding specialist housing/care homes. In addition I am passionate about the environment, biodiversity and protecting the countryside. Energy efficiency is connected to caring for the environment in my view. Regarding public spaces, I strongly believe that we owe it to the future generations to avoid concreting over the green belt. Human beings need open spaces and fresh air.

When did we last overhaul the road system in Kent, to cope with the increased number of homes & in turn cars using the roads?

When did we last build a new reservoirs ? Or look at a different way to collect & save water. Maybe using sea water we are an island surrounded by water, we should never run out. We keep building new houses but don't add to the infrastructure to support them. The south east is becoming gridlocked. This is a ideal time to level up.

We need to look at reuseable energy ,to make, to store to futureproof our country.

They are the most important things.

Our nation is currently suffering a shocking decline in biodiversity. As a predominantly rural borough we have a responsibility to address this as a matter of urgency. Building on the green belt would just make it worse!

We need to balance the need for affordable housing with more active lifestyles in open spaces, including new ones.

For any development to meet its sustainability objectives it needs to recognise the environment in which it is being proposed: to achieve SA 2. 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 (SA10); additional pavements and lighting along Claire Lane would cause damage to a distinct countryside environment impacting wildlife habitat (SA 5 and SA 6) through disruption of wildlife habitats and interruption of "darksies" environments; the scale of the developments will materially impact what has been described in the "East Malling Conservation Study" as an areas of "Unspoilt beauty" and would disturb the distinct, historic

---

**User Response: Text**

characters of East Malling and West Malling villages

Regarding SA 11 and 12: 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)

Regarding SA 14: Of the proposed developments only a very small proportion are affordable to young buyers in the local demographic

These are priorities in our community. I would also suggest air quality

We have an over-heated housing market. Housing developers are commercially led so inevitably exacerbate this by maximising their profits and building too few homes that 1st time buyers can afford. If this kind of building is allowed on Green Belt land, we have failed on 2 counts:

- 1) not building the houses that are most needed
- 2) losing open spaces and the biodiversity that thrives in it

Tackling Climate Change is the key issue of our time and every part of the plan must focus on that.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, 1st time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away any time soon and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive. Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Affordable Housing to Rent – Housing should primarily be about providing warm, secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity

---

**User Response: Text**

should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front-line public staR who serve their community.

Energy Efficiency – Cutting consumption is going to benefit everyone in terms of the environment and finances. Allowing residents to keep more of their income rather than paying high energy bills, and business to increase their profit margins and thrive.

Water Efficiency - in terms of consumption and waste creation is a key consideration and reducing individual consumption by using technology such as grey water recycling should be a priority. In terms of wastewater we need to minimise the volume of water fed into the foul sewerage system to use swales and other SUDS techniques to clean surface water before it finds its way into the environment.

Housing should primarily be about proving wars secure, aesthetically pleasing shelter that is low cost so that people can save more of their income to enjoy living life. Buying property as a commodity should be a secondary consideration. The borough needs more homes for front line staff who serve their community

All are important, these I feel are first priority.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.

Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Vital to create sustainable developments in view of the current climate crisis.

---

**User Response: Text**

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!!

Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers. Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

**GP surgery** - The local surgery cannot cope at the moment, and many people are forced to use private medical services because they cannot get an appointment. Adding 1,000's of additional houses will only increase this problem.

**Schools** - The local schools are already full, and with no secondary school on KH, pupils are forced to use public transport or parents vehicles.

**Stores/Shops** - The existing stores are at capacity with the current population, the new Aldi store will possibly relieve this, but the amenities present are still insufficient for the population. No petrol station/Charging station, no Newspaper/magazine outlets (Asda/Morrisons do not display them in time for the main morning commuter)

**Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change**

We support the need to meet the boroughs objective needs for housing, particularly affordable housing, in a manner that promotes more sustainable patterns of development. We also support the Council's acknowledgment that this cannot be attained from urban sources of land alone. The release of land adjoining the main urban areas will complement and support the draft Local Plans objectives, including the provision of new accessible open spaces, and a range of housing, including family housing less easy to accommodate through urban densification policies, and a range of other benefits associated with new development.

SUDs and water efficiency are linked. SUDs are a requirement by drainage authorities and Environment agency. Water efficiency in the home and provision of water butts and green roofs are not and something that should be required by development management policies.

Space standards and zero carbon dwellings are fundamental issues.

All homes should be to high standards despite tenure.

These policy requirements affect everyone and are covered in some way either by Government Acts, Regulations

---

## User Response: Text

and/or Policy.

Once high standards of building stock are required and secured the type and tenure come later and have been addressed under other questions in this questionnaire.

The issues we are invited to prioritise are dominated by aspects of housing and omit other topics which should be policy priorities; Constraints and standards are different to what should be built to fulfil needs. Of course we need 'affordable homes' – but let's not pose the questions as an alternative to 'space standards' and 'zero carbon homes'. They are not either or. The answers should not exclude each other. The questions group wrong issues together.

Nine of these identified 'policy requirements' are WHAT i.e.

? Accessible and adaptable housing,

? Active travel,

? Affordable housing to buy,

? Affordable housing to rent,

? First homes,

? Indoor recreation facilities,

? Parking

? Self-build and/ or custom Housebuilding,

? Specialist housing.

Nine of these 'policy requirements' are related to HOW these requirements should be built and developments be designed and what should be cared for. i.e.:

? Biodiversity and ecology,

? Energy efficiency,

? Internal space standards,

? MMC,

? Public Open Space,

? Renewable energy generation,

? Safety and security,

? SUDS,

? Water efficiency,

There are lots of other policy requirements – such as AIR QUALITY and infrastructure which have been left out.

The questions in this questionnaire have continually mixed up constraints and standards with what must be provided/developed to meet needs, therefore the analysis of this consultation response will be skewed and will not reflect what people's preferences are.

SUDs and water efficiency are linked. SUDs are a requirement by drainage authorities and Environment agency. Water efficiency in the home and provision of water butts and green roofs are not and something that should be required by development management policies.

Space standards and zero carbon dwellings are fundamental issues.

All homes should be to high standards despite tenure.

These policy requirements affect everyone and are covered in some way either by Government Acts, Regulations and/or Policy.

Once high standards of building stock are required and secured the type and tenure come later and have been addressed under other questions in this questionnaire.



---

## User Response: Text

**The issues we are invited to prioritise are dominated by aspects of housing and omit other topics which should be policy priorities; Constraints and standards are different to what should be built to fulfil needs. For instance - Of course we need ‘affordable homes’ – but let’s not pose the questions as an alternative to ‘space standards’ and ‘zero carbon homes’. They are not either or. The answers should not exclude each other. The questions group wrong issues together.**

Nine of these identified ‘policy requirements’ are WHAT i.e.

- Accessible and adaptable housing,
- Active travel,
- Affordable housing to buy,
- Affordable housing to rent,
- First homes,
- Indoor recreation facilities,
- Parking
- Self-build and/ or custom Housebuilding,
- Specialist housing.

Nine of these ‘policy requirements’ are related to HOW these requirements should be built and developments be designed and what should be cared for. i.e.:

- Biodiversity and ecology,
- Energy efficiency,
- Internal space standards,
- MMC,
- Public Open Space,
- Renewable energy generation,
- Safety and security,
- SUDS,
- Water efficiency,

There are lots of other policy requirements – such as AIR QUALITY and infrastructure which have been left out.

The questions in this questionnaire have continually mixed-up constraints and standards with what must be provided/developed to meet needs, therefore the analysis of this consultation response will be skewed and will not reflect what people’s preferences are.

Gladman consider that each of the policy requirements has its own merits.

Affordable housing and First Homes are essential to help address the current levels of unaffordability in TMBC. Other policy requirements should be considered within the context of sustainable development and the Council must ensure that the

Tonbridge & Malling Local Plan Reg. 18 Representations

26

requirements do not impact viability or contribute to delays in the delivery of much needed housing. Each policy requirement should be considered as part of a holistic approach to meeting housing needs and allocating suitable sites for residential

---

## User Response: Text

development.

- Policies which enhance the preservation and protection of local historic landscapes
- A range of other policies which support local people including:
  - **Those which safeguard existing natural amenities including Public open spaces, including village and green spaces as provided for in the local area through the network of rural footpaths and the Quiet Lane network.**
  - Policies which encourage Biodiversity and Ecology.

There is a need for affordable housing, first homes, elderly downsizing and care and addressing energy and efficiency

WMPC believes that the policies with the highest priority should be those which contribute to stabilising and reversing global heating and providing accommodation for low-income families.

Social Housing or an equivalent product is necessary for lower income families who are priced out of the market by demand and higher wages driven by the London Market.

Quality of life for residents.

Note that limiting choices seems inappropriate as all are very important and there are probably others that could be added

Page 30 of 114

Safety and security are becoming an increasing issue due to poor design rules within the existing building developments, such as car barns and courtyard parking which result in dark areas where belongings cannot be effectively secured and can be the target for criminal behaviour. It is believed that the lack of youth facilities is significantly contributing to antisocial behaviour on Kings Hill, but the nature of the agreement with one of the parties developing the site precludes effective action being taken by the parish or the borough.

Quality of life for residents.

Note that limiting choices seems inappropriate as all are very important and there are probably others that could be added

Safety and security are becoming an increasing issue due to poor design rules within the existing building developments, such as car barns and courtyard parking which result in dark areas where belongings cannot be effectively secured and can be the target for criminal behaviour. It is believed that the lack of youth facilities is significantly contributing to antisocial behaviour on Kings Hill, but the nature of the agreement with one of the parties developing the site precludes effective action being taken by the parish or the borough.

---

**User Response: Text**

Trenport only make further comment on the commentary in para. 6.1.6 regarding whole plan viability. At this stage of the plan making process no options are presented as to the level of affordable housing (in whatever tenure) that the Council will be seeking. In assessing whole plan viability, Trenport would raise the following points :-

1. It is essential that the Council commits to engaging with the development industry in emerging viability evidence (as previously with the withdrawn Local Plan) such that it is 'real world' based and not a theoretical viability exercise;
2. It is fundamental that the Council recognises the variation in sales values across the plan area. What Trenport can achieve in the Medway Valley is significantly less than what can be achieved in the south of the Borough at, for example, Tonbridge.
3. Any affordable housing policies, whilst based on viability at a point in time, must recognise that variation in economic and fiscal conditions during the plan period will have a significant effect on viability. The current economic downturn, increased build costs, and mortgage rate rises have had a profound effect on the viability of development. Affordable housing policies will need to be flexible to allow for changing economic circumstances.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.

Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.

Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.

Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, first time buyers.

Older citizens do not all want to move into special accommodation!! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME and a lot of recent developments have completely failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is that surrounding streets become oversubscribed for parking of vehicles from new developments.

**In conclusion,**

**I strongly object to the proposals. There has been no mention of extended infrastructure.**

---

**User Response: Text**

**What about Improved roads, access to the motorway, (which would all need to come through Wrotham Heath which is already a bottle neck) not to mention schools, hospitals, doctors surgeries, drainage, water supply etc etc? The list goes on but nowhere in the report is any of this mentioned.**

**The whole idea of 3000 homes is totally unsustainable.**

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

If the population of Tonbridge and Hildenborough increases as predicted it will be necessary to take such steps as mentioned above.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

**Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change**

I don't consider many of the options relevant to issues of viability for the Local Plan.

Several options are either a requirement under planning regulation or under building regulation and therefore irrelevant for plan making.

Climate change should be the top priority in all aspects of planning development expansion

- Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change.

- Policies which enhance the preservation and protection of local historic landscapes

- A range of other policies which support local people including:

- **Those which safeguard existing natural amenities including Public open spaces, including village and green spaces as provided for in the local area through the network of rural footpaths and the Quiet Lane network.**

- Policies which encourage Biodiversity and Ecology.

The affordability of housing in the South East is becoming out of reach. We need to protect against urban sprawl encroaching on existing community boundaries.

---

**User Response: Text**

It is important that first homes should be within in financial reach pf these single/young couples/or young families to help grow the local economy.

There does not seem to be enough affordable housing. Parking is frequently a problem and more provision should be made.

A community should be for all. Houses can build in energy/water saving at the outset.

The local plan does not address the reality of work/life. People travel several miles to their employment. These distances are beyond a cycling range. The same often applies to schools and some recreation facilities.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change Local requirement (alphabetical order)

Any housing built should strive to mitigate Climate Change.

For Question 35 & 36 [biodiversity net gain] above

- Q.35 Yes, 10% should be guaranteed as the absolute **minimum but with the objective of seeking a greater target minimum of 20%** net gain in biodiversity. This should be heavily encouraged in an attempt to undo much of the environmental damage incurred in recent years
- Q.36 Yes, this could and should always be catered for
- In the North-East of the borough this could be achieved through the positive revision of Green Belt boundaries and the inclusion of open spaces and village greens

**In conclusion:**

**I strongly object to the proposals. There has been no mention of extended infrastructure, which, as mentioned above, in many cases is not viable in any case.**

**What about improved roads, access to the motorway, not to mention schools, hospitals, doctors surgeries,**

---

**User Response: Text**

**drainage, water supply, etc etc? The list goes on, but nowhere in the report is any of this mentioned.**

**The whole idea of expansion of anything like this size is totally unsustainable.**

Creating accessible and adaptable housing within development promotes inclusivity and a sense of community

Affordable housing to buy provides homes for local people,

Energy efficiency insures residents are less affected

by cost of living rises

Provision of parking prevents roadside and pavement parking

Sustainable drainage will help manage the effects of climate change

We have briefly outlined some of our reasons, as follows:

? Affordable housing – this is our greatest housing need, so ‘robust’ policies should mandate a higher proportion of affordable housing (e.g. 50%, not 40%), as stated above (Q.12 & 19).

? Parking – such provisions need to reflect the local car ownership levels and local needs.

? Public open space – as noted above (in Q.38), it is vital that every community has access to public amenity spaces (incl. children play areas), within a safe walking distance (<500m).

**I am particularly concerned about proposed development off Snoll Hatch Road and to the rear of Stockenbury, site plan 59613 refers.**

**This site is directly on the back of Stockenbury where I live. Stockenbury is a very quiet cul de sac and you can imagine the residents would like to keep it this way. My concerns are:-**

- **Stockenbury is too narrow to allow for large plant to gain access to the site if development was approved**
- **Again too narrow if used as access/egress from any development**
- **Very near flood plain. Concern that development would make this worse.**
- **On a more general note, there are not sufficient facilities in the village to support large developments – no GP surgery, no direct train links, very few shops, only a medium sized school, narrow, rural roads to navigate.**

I would also like to object for the following reasons:

**Traffic/Parking** - This is already becoming an issue because of builders/planners not reserving enough parking

---

**User Response: Text**

for each household. Pressure on parking will increase with the implementation of yellow lines. Further developments will increase this further.

**GP surgery** - The local surgery cannot cope at the moment, and many people are forced to use private medical services because they cannot get an appointment. Adding 1,000's of additional houses will only increase this problem.

**Schools** - The local schools are already full, and with no secondary school on KH, pupils are forced to use public transport or parents vehicles.

**Public Transport** - Poor & expensive public transport links to West Malling, Maidstone, Tonbridge etc. No useful shuttle service between station and Kings Hill, forcing unnecessary use of many cars. Sporadic bus service that is under-used and services are being cut as a result. Schoolchildren crammed into under-funded private buses who can't afford to operate. More people and no change to all of that = even more disastrous for everyone.

We must find a way to conserve water after this years drought.

Creating accessible and adaptable housing within development promotes inclusivity and a sense of community

Affordable housing to buy provides homes for local people,

Energy efficiency insures residents are less affected

by cost of living rises

Provision of parking prevents roadside and pavement parking

Sustainable drainage will help manage the effects of climate change

Too many modern housing developments are spoiled by the masses of cars parked on the highway. Water and biodiversity are key factors.

All have a focus on climate change and people's health and wellbeing

Chronic shortage of suitable housing for our ageing population and our younger generations who aspire to get on the housing ladder.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

---

**User Response: Text**

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

Cheaper housing must be made available for the young, fist time buyers. Older citizens do NOT all want to move into special accommodation! Cars are not going away for a LONG TIME & many recent developments have failed to provide sufficient parking. The outcome is surrounding streets become over subscribed for parking vehicles from new developments.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

**Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change**

We must build to mitigate Climare change. Properly insulated homes with renewable energy and sustainable water collection / drainage systems are needed, not poor quality shoeboxes squeezed onto farmland and green fields to benefit developers.

- Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate climate change

The greenbelt should not be moved from one locality to another.

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

**Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change**

**In conclusion,**

**I strongly object to the proposals. There has been no mention of extended infrastructure.**

**What about Improved roads, access to the motorway, (which would all need to come through Wrotham Heath which is already a bottle neck) not to mention schools, hospitals, doctors surgeries, drainage, water supply etc etc? The list goes on but nowhere in the report is any of this mentioned.**

**The whole idea of 3000 homes is totally unsustainable.**

Young people are eager to get on the housing ladder at a price they can afford and in a place that is safe and secure, surrounded by the greenness of nature.



---

**User Response: Text**

Sustainable development for all

Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change

Protecting the environment is everything.

Future housing should accommodate and mitigate climate change.

Creating accessible and adaptable housing within development promotes inclusivity and a sense of community

Affordable housing to buy provides homes for local people,

Energy efficiency insures residents are less affected by cost of living rises

Provision of parking prevents roadside and pavement parking

Sustainable drainage will help manage the effects of climate change

Additional note from myself :

I strongly believe that the amount of building planned within East Malling and the surrounding areas is already at a saturation level. Any more and life will become un bearable for the existing residents with the clogged roads, pollution, impossible health care and general lack of green space. This will have a massive impact on the mental health of many and thus serving to have an effect on families and family life. With the increased popularity of online shopping we will soon have ghost towns forming with the sad closure of many shops and businesses. There will then be many buildings for conversion to housing. Any development within Maidstone should take multi storey accommodation into account to relieve the countryside and rural areas. We are losing our Garden of England status and becoming a Concrete Jungle. We cannot be a self sufficient island if we are building on valuable farm land. We cannot export goods if we cannot grow them. To build on farm land should not be considered at ALL. There are other areas like the land opposite the Moat public house/ hotel in Wrotham where the old Stocks nightclub once stood. There is a main road, easy access to the site, the area is not built up and very easy access to the motorway. Why has this not been built upon instead of a working arable farmland ( 40 acres), research station land etc.,

I understand a local plan is needed, please take all of this into account so we can keep our villages from getting choked and protect our heritage, green spaces and wildlife.

**Section B – BAG’s Responses to Regulation 18 Consultation Questions**

For convenience, some questions have been summarised rather than restated in full, although the answers are

---

**User Response: Text**

given with reference to the full questions as detailed in the Reg 18 consultation document. BAG has responded to those questions relevant to its Constitution i.e. questions 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,33,34,35,36,37,39,40,41,42,43, 47,49, 50.

**Q1) Which elements should feature in the vision for the borough in 2040?**

All suggested points are equally important but BAG is focused on preserving a place where biodiversity thrives alongside communities, existing landscapes and open countryside are respected and are easily accessed and enjoyed (as they are now). Synthetic creation of urban spaces is unnecessary and should be avoided.

**Q36 Should the council allocate sites specifically for Biodiversity Net Gain within the Local Plan?**

Yes, BAG believes this could and should be catered for. For the North-East of the borough, this could be achieved through the positive revision of Green Belt boundaries.

**Q37 Which Design Matters are most important to you?**

The design matters listed are all important and it should be the responsibility of professional planning staff to ensure developers understand and adhere to such matters during preplanning processes and that there is proper enforcement of such design factors when developments are actually built.

We need affordable housing to rent & buy for young & old. We all need green space & trees for our health plus more entertainment i.e. cinema in Tonbridge.

All are important to village life and local areas.

Answer: I don't consider many of the options relevant to issues of viability for the Local Plan. Several options are either a requirement under planning regulation or under building regulation and therefore irrelevant for plan making. Climate change should be the top priority in all aspects of planning development expansion

[Q.35. Should the council be seeking more than 10% Biodiversity Net Gain, if viable? Yes/No]

Answer: Yes, of course. TMBC could be a beacon Planning Authority with 15% BNG.

[Q.36. Should the council allocate sites specifically for Biodiversity Net Gain within the Local Plan? Yes/No]

Answer: Yes and this can be part of the green space strategy from Q.33

**In conclusion:**

---

**User Response: Text**

There has been no real mention of extending the existing infrastructure around Borough Green and Ightham. What about Improved roads and access to the motorway M20, which would all need to come through Wrotham Heath; this is already a bottle neck. Also, there is no specific reference to the need for additional schools, hospitals, local surgeries, drainage, water supply etc.?

- Any houses we do have to build should strive to mitigate Climate Change.
- The climate emergency should be responded to through carbon emission reduction (less dependency on private vehicle use/integration of EV charging points), fabric first approaches and circular economy principles.

Report run at 15 Jun 2023 15:16:35. Total records: 501

This page is intentionally left blank