
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 highlightedkey 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 existng 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 Wateringbury 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).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

I support the Green 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).

[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

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 Wateringbury 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