

Off-street response – Reference number 3

I object to the proposed changes.

I very strongly object to this proposal. I am a parent at Slade school. The proposed extension would result in valuable green land being built on. This green space next to the car park is currently used by families and children on a daily basis to run around a play. There are small children that use the swings and it would be awful if this were to be built on and the children would lose this space. I also believe it would be unsafe to increase the number of cars given that many families use this path to get to and from school. There are plenty of places to park in town. I disagree that there are not enough spaces in this carpark. There is always space to park and I have never had an issue finalising a space. Lower castle carpark also is a very short walk away and is rarely full. This is a completely unnecessary proposal that would result in the destruction of valuable green space. The proposal should be thrown out.

Off-street response – Reference number 4

I object to the proposed changes.

It is a nice area of grass for children to play on. Turning it into a carpark will ruin a nice area between the school and the castle. Please don't do it.

Off-street response – Reference number 5

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 6

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 7

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 8

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 10

I support the proposed changes.

As long as any extension preserves an area of green for children to play on the swings with their families. Any extension should have minimal impact upon the green feel of area.

Off-street response – Reference number 11

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 12

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 13

I object to the proposed changes.

The area would be far better served by the planting of more trees.

Off-street response – Reference number 15

I support the proposed changes.

A great idea

Off-street response – Reference number 16

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 19

I support the proposed changes.

This car park is heavily used at all time often over flowing. I'm sure the local residents will welcome the change.

Off-street response – Reference number 20

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 21

I object to the proposed changes.

The area between the castle and Slade Primary School would be ruined and further discourage people to walk and cycle to the school. This is currently an area where children play and families picnic before and after school, and if anything more play facilities and cycle hubs should be added.

Off-street response – Reference number 22

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 23

I object to the proposed changes.

The green area and swings are a safe area for Slade children to use before and after school. It's used daily and is used for picnics and social gatherings all year round.

It would be such a shame to see this area disappear.

My other concern is the increase in traffic in that area. It's dangerous with the amount of school children and the little roads are not suitable for heavy car flow.

Off-street response – Reference number 24

I object to the proposed changes.

This would be absolutely criminal, impacting the nature of the grounds around an historic monument. There is plenty of parking in Tonbridge town centre.

This is also a green area kids from the local school use constantly before and after school. Honestly, have you no shame.

Off-street response – Reference number 25

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 26

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 28

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 33

I object to the proposed changes.

Children play in the area every day after school and frequently school families meet up for picnics after school. It would mean an increase in traffic on these roads and impact on the air quality of the children at slade school

Off-street response – Reference number 34

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 35

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 36

I object to the proposed changes.

The slade cannot support more parking - there is already too much traffic going down. Parking should be further out (sainsburys) not in this residential area. The grassy area is a well used play area by slade kids, and it would put them and the school kids in increased danger by increasing car flow

Off-street response – Reference number 37

I object to the proposed changes.

We should be increasing the green space around our amenity and leisure spaces, not building more car parks. Particularly adjacent to a primary school.

We have many under used parking areas in the town within easy walking distance of the High Street. Rather than tarmacking over green spaces we should be encouraging use of existing facilities. Some improved signage perhaps? This would have the added benefit of encouraging people to walk a little more.

You also make no mention of the cost of implementing this proposed car park ? What are the upfront costs Vs revenue return calculations . This surely should also be in the public domain. After all it is our money that will fund this . Please remember your purpose is to support and improve ratepayers enjoyment and services. Not revenue generating.

Off-street response – Reference number 39

I object to the proposed changes.

The castle is a historic place in Tonbridge and this proposal will further deteriorate the site by pouring more concrete and asphalt where the greenery is supposed to be one of the attractions for the visitors. The function of the council is to serve the local population and this proposal is purely focused on squeezing profits out of the said population disregarding their quality of life and happiness.

Off-street response – Reference number 40

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 41

I object to the proposed changes.

Keep the green space

Off-street response – Reference number 42

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 44

I object to the proposed changes.

I strongly oppose the extension of this car park. There is ample parking within easy walking distance of the castle already and this proposal will essentially add more concrete and tarmac to the area surrounding the castle, degrading the area.

Off-street response – Reference number 45

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 46

I support the proposed changes.

This car park is regularly full so an extension would be most welcomed although I think these 28 bays would fill up quickly

Off-street response – Reference number 47

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is used by children to play after school and will spoil the lovely green areas in front of the castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 48

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 49

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 50

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 52

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is used as a green space for children at the Slade school. It's used every day by children playing on it. Also it would mean hundreds of children walking through a giant car park to get to school every day.

Off-street response – Reference number 55

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 58

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 59

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 61

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 64

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 65

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 67

I object to the proposed changes.

The area next to the car park is a lovely open space in an area of such built up housing. With a 400 pupil primary school the opposite side of the road is regularly used to get child away from the busy road/ Slade junction and to the safety of a grass area. Slade Primary parents do not use this car park as we have permits for Lower castle field. So extending that car park only takes away valuable space used very regularly by surrounding occupants. The Lower castle field is perfectly sufficient for over flow parking.

There will be huge disappointment if this extension were to go ahead.

Off-street response – Reference number 70

I object to the proposed changes.

The swings and the grass area are both used on a daily basis by a large number of children - both at pick up / drop off times for Slade, but also during school hours / at weekends. This is a valuable green space which is heavily used throughout the week, when the carpark often has spaces and is only really full at the weekend. The rewards of the extra carparking spaces, which are needed over a few hours by a small number of people, cannot be worth more than the many hours of time that many people spend using the green space - and that is without considering the environmental benefit to the area from having the hedging / trees / grass close together, and the issues with traffic that already exist on the local roads

Off-street response – Reference number 71

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 72

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 73

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 74

I object to the proposed changes.

More vehicles and more pollution near a local school!

Taking away a space kids love to enjoy after school

Off-street response – Reference number 75

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is used by children every single day and is a safe place for them to walk to school and play. There are so many other areas like behind the old pound land which could be used for parking. There are so many empty spaces which are residents only. This would be a huge mistake to be removing these swings and replace it with parking.

Off-street response – Reference number 78

I object to the proposed changes.

There are Swings just beside the car park and any extension would put these swings at risks, meaning kids won't be able to play.

Off-street response – Reference number 79

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 81

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 82

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 83

I object to the proposed changes.

I object very strongly to additional parking spaces in Tonbridge. The town is carpeted with parking spaces already. The council should not be encouraging people to drive or wasting tax payers' money on additional parking spaces. The council should be encouraging other forms of active travel and spending this budget on that.

Off-street response – Reference number 84

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 87

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 88

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 89

I object to the proposed changes.

I think that green space should be preserved

Off-street response – Reference number 90

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 92

(no comment supplied)

Do not frequent Tonbridge so cannot comment

Off-street response – Reference number 93

(no comment supplied)

N/A

Off-street response – Reference number 95

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 97

I support the proposed changes.

I support the idea in principle, but would like to know how it will be achieved.

Off-street response – Reference number 98

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 99

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 100

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 101

I object to the proposed changes.

Leave the green space - there is plenty of parking at the swimming pool and Rugby club, just around the corner and Waitrose and Sainsbury's. Also there is road side parking too.

Off-street response – Reference number 102

I object to the proposed changes.

Please do not rip up the field for more vehicles. Can you not introduce bike racks to encourage cycling? There are so many car parks in Tonbridge. It might mean families have to walk a few extra minutes to the sports ground but parking facilities ARE THERE. Please, please do not rip up part of the field - and where children go after school to play with their friends - for what seems essentially like an additional money making scheme.

Off-street response – Reference number 103

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 104

I object to the proposed changes.

See above, plenty of parking bays within walking distance of Tonbridge Castle

Off-street response – Reference number 106

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 107

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 108

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 110

I object to the proposed changes.

The kids that go to slade really enjoy playing there after school and by the swings this would also affect the safety of the area with more cars and less space to safer my play around it.

Off-street response – Reference number 111

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 113

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 114

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 116

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 117

I object to the proposed changes.

Slade school use a different car park where they get 20m free for drop off. Also, the children play football before and after school. I STRONGLY OBJECT to this plan of removing the grass area! Also, why encourage more road users when the gridlock is horrendous most mornings and evenings?

Off-street response – Reference number 118

I object to the proposed changes.

Awful, selfish idea. Children love playing there and they are safe. There are also some beautiful trees there. The slade area is already congested with too many cars. There will also be more accidents involving children if they have hardly anywhere to go that isn't surrounded by vehicles. Stop taking away open, green spaces and paving it over just to make more money.

Off-street response – Reference number 119

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 120

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 121

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 122

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 124

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 125

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 127

I object to the proposed changes.

There are already significant parking options in the local area.

Off-street response – Reference number 129

I object to the proposed changes.

I think that there is spare capacity in the nearby car park by the river

Off-street response – Reference number 130

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 131

I object to the proposed changes.

Extension will cause environmental damage and more parking spaces will lead to more traffic and congestion in an area with a school nearby. Traffic through Tonbridge is bad enough without adding to the problem. Encourage people to walk or cycle. Promote a Green agenda!

Off-street response – Reference number 132

I object to the proposed changes.

Please do not take away this valuable green space. It's a wonderful space for children to play before and after school and also other children during the day and over the weekends. It's a really important walkway for the community and children are so often using it. It will make it more dangerous if you allow cars to be all through this area. Please don't do this to our beloved green space just for more car spaces.

Off-street response – Reference number 133

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 134

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 135

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 136

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 137

I object to the proposed changes.

The grassy area is well used by families and children. It would be a shame to lose this space. I also have concerns about the safety of the many children who walk this way to and from Slade primary school if the car park area is extended

Off-street response – Reference number 138

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 139

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 142

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 143

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 144

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 145

I object to the proposed changes.

The area in question is right next to the path leading to Slade school and the much used swings this would create a danger to children and increased difficult in crossing the road to Slade school. The lower car park is within 2 mins walking distance and often has spaces (as does the upper). This seems a solution aimed at a couple of events per year as the risk of safety to a school used 5 days per week. Thez number of spaces does not equal any a lost spaces so in no way contributes to reducing short car jounries

Off-street response – Reference number 146

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 147

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 149

I object to the proposed changes.

Removes green space sightlines towards the castle

Off-street response – Reference number 151

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 154

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 156

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 157

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 159

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 160

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 161

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 162

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 163

I object to the proposed changes.

There is no point on sacrificing one of the only bits of greenery that doesn't get flooded for a few more spaces. The lawn is used by lots of kids exercising after school which is something we sorely need given the obesity epidemic. Most of the time there is capacity in existing car park and we should be encouraging using public transport anyway and people in the catchment area need to walk the kids. Not to mention the road by the Slade is very congested and people pulling on and off the car park right next to the school would make crossing dangerous and traversing the road much slower and it's already pretty slow. It seems extremely unlikely it would significantly increase revenue for the Castle's events anyway given a lot of people just walk around Tonbridge and it's accessible by bus and train. This is a terrible idea.

Off-street response – Reference number 165

I object to the proposed changes.

I often park here and never find it full. The green space around is heavily used by local children, especially when schools are finishing for the day. This is a safe place allowing them and their parents to gather before going home without being near any of the roads. Tonbridge has sufficient parking spaces already and taking away green space is contrary to the needs of the inhabitants and the town's natural biodiversity.

Off-street response – Reference number 168

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 169

I object to the proposed changes.

Given the proximity to the local school it seems absurd to introduce more hazards and to destroy one of very few grass areas in the town outside of the park which is prone to regular flooding. The car park is not full during the day as it currently stands so additional spaces will not actually generate additional income

Off-street response – Reference number 170

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 171

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 172

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 173

I object to the proposed changes.

My 7 year old is a pupil at Slade Primary School, the green area opposite the school is used by many of the school children before and after school. The classes use the grass area for class gatherings every end of term as its opposite a primary school. I strongly object on the grounds of road safety, the roads not being suitable for increased cars, and it being a shame for the local environment. Also I'm commenting as a former resident of The Slade for 8 years.

Off-street response – Reference number 175

I support the proposed changes.

Depending on planning

Off-street response – Reference number 176

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a green area for children to play on and its in keeping with the castle and surrounding areas and it's very used by local residents

Off-street response – Reference number 177

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space here is used by many children to play on. It would spoil this and the look of the castle area to concrete over it

Off-street response – Reference number 178

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 179

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 180

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 181

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 182

I object to the proposed changes.

Will ruin the area we all use and certainly make it dangerous for school children walking through

Off-street response – Reference number 183

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 185

I object to the proposed changes.

This loses green space where mine and many children play in. Green spaces are very important for our planet and more important than parking. You should encouraging people to walk or use public transport. Also many people walk that way to the Slade School & it makes it dangerous to add more cars. Lot if children play there particularly after school & it is lovely to see. Please don't destroy this green space.

Off-street response – Reference number 186

I object to the proposed changes.

Out of keeping with the conservative area it's in.

Off-street response – Reference number 188

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is well used by local school children as both a route to/from school and for play. Additionally local roads are narrow and would not support additional traffic. It would reduce the safety of users.

Off-street response – Reference number 189

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 190

I object to the proposed changes.

The extension is not needed as there is a large nearby carpark by the swimming pool which is rarely fully occupied.

In addition the proposed location would put off parents allowing their children to play on the swings as the swings would then be hemmed in on two sides by cars and subsequently be too close to moving traffic in the carpark.

Off-street response – Reference number 191

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 193

I object to the proposed changes.

Children regularly play on this area of green space

Off-street response – Reference number 194

I object to the proposed changes.

I strongly object to this proposed extension. This green area is currently enjoyed by local and visiting adults and children alike. It is an area frequently used by the children of The Slade primary school and could pose a danger to them.

Off-street response – Reference number 195

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 198

I object to the proposed changes.

My children attend Slade Primary school and spend time in this green space, playing after school. We walk to and from school across this area almost every day. Many children play ball games on the grass throughout the week and over the weekend. There are a very large number of children passing this area in the mornings and afternoons. Encouraging more traffic to the area poses potential safety risks, not least from emissions very close to Slade school, may discourage walking to school and encourage more families to drive to school. This also sets a very poor example to the children about the need to protect our environment and green spaces.

Paving over town centre green spaces is not sustainable and should be discouraged. I would expect the council to be following a policy of enhancing our green spaces, not pouring concrete over them. This proposal is out of touch and ill conceived.

There are a number of trees which would have to be felled, some of which have been recently planted, which would diminish the biodiversity and have negative environmental impacts. Wildflowers grow in the grass, providing food for pollinators.

Green space is essential for public health and wellbeing, climate mitigation and biodiversity. I expect the council to recognise and protect our dwindling green spaces, particularly in this built up area.

There is ample parking in the town already, so demand does not appear to justify such extreme measures. Access to the car park requires vehicles to drive up the high street, which will compound the existing high traffic emissions issues.

Our green spaces should be protected by the council, for the good of the community. They have far more value in the town than potential increases in council revenue. Green space mitigates effects of pollution and reduces urban heat effects. It is very disappointing to learn that the council holds the widely accepted health and environmental benefits of green spaces with such little regard.

The council should familiarise itself with the Public Health England 2020 review, "Improving Access to Greenspace", written to help local areas consider how good quality greenspace can support the delivery of health, social, environmental and economic priorities, ultimately improving the wellbeing of local communities and helping to reduce health inequalities.

It is unclear how this proposal is compatible with tmhc's own climate change strategy and action plan. I hope this proposal is not indicative of a lack of commitment to those positive goals.

Paving over a popular green area and community open space is unjustifiable, unnecessary, would have a disproportionately negative impact on the local environment generally and children of Slade school in particular. I hope and expect this aspect of the proposal to be withdrawn.

Off-street response – Reference number 199

I object to the proposed changes.

We would like to keep the green space and access to swings

Off-street response – Reference number 201

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 203

I object to the proposed changes.

Green space in this area should be preserved

Off-street response – Reference number 204

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 205

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a vital path to Slade school, and the grassy area is heavily used and enjoyed by children of the school and beyond. It would be completely inappropriate to expand this area.

Off-street response – Reference number 206

I support the proposed changes.

So long as it doesn't effect the paths and play area I can see no problem

Off-street response – Reference number 207

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 208

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 210

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 211

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 212

I object to the proposed changes.

It is a lovely green area next to the swings and visible from the school and local properties, so turning so much of it into a carpark is not something I can support.

Sticking to the current side of the path that the car park is on and raising the drop there to provide a few more spaces might be a better alternative, but not sure if the costs would justify the amount of space created.

Off-street response – Reference number 214

I object to the proposed changes.

As a Slade resident, I wholeheartedly object to the extension of the Upper Castle Field car park. Turning it into a grey site with more cars would detract from the aesthetics of the local area. Further this is a "key" greenspace, being used by children of Slade school (as it is so accessible) and also by dog walkers frequently. A focus should be on providing active and public transport facilities for children at the school and those that go to the swimming pool/castle. The parking provisions by the swimming pool and the castle are more than adequate for groups unable to walk.

It is scientifically proven that greenspace greatly improves the urban environment, e.g. the health of residents, air quality, and air temperatures, all of which are damaged by increasing car use. See <https://www.who.int/europe/publications/m/item/urban-green-space-interventions-and-health--a-review-of-impacts-and-effectiveness.-full-report> and also <https://doi-org.iclibezp1.cc.ic.ac.uk/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.030> .

This is also a focus area for the national conservative government: see the 25 year environment plan and natural capital assessments:
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/articles/naturalcapitalaccountsroadmap/2022#major-progress-made-over-the-last-10-years>

If the council were to extend the Upper Castle Field car park, they would be actively going against their own policies.

Off-street response – Reference number 215

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space in the upper castle field carpark is used daily, mostly weekdays, by children playing. Please don't take it away. Promote more cycling with bike parking facilities. More walking and more public transport. Less carcentric-please!

Off-street response – Reference number 217

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 218

I object to the proposed changes.

My son attends The Slade primary school and I find the situation in Upper Castle Field already find the public space architecture highly unsuitable for pedestrians - there is always considerable footfall congestion during school drop off and collection. If anything the footpath needs to be widened, not

be encroached by yet more car parking spaces. I strongly object to the extension of the Upper Castle Field car park.

Off-street response – Reference number 219

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 221

I object to the proposed changes.

I absolutely object to this proposal, which has generated fury within the Slade and among Slade school parents. The green space between the school and the castle is cherished, vital to families as an extended place to play after school and one of only a few remaining green spaces in the town besides the sports ground. Please, make no mistake: it is this area that our children seek to play in before returning home despite the proximity of the general park and rugby field. The provision for more cars in this area is a danger to school pupils, who are accompanied by far younger children on the walk to and from school. The car park already provides a danger to manage with young children intent on playing chase and playing ball games, Having wide uninterrupted green space allows us parents a protection and clear demarked areas to manage the walk from the school to the swings. The walk also offers a loved view of the school with the variety of trees a treat to observe through the seasons. The increased interest in occasional and seasonal events in the castle is not justification to permanently alter an area which is a salvation to hundreds and hundreds of families 365 days of the year. The town is almost unrivalled for train access, there are numerous parking options within the town and supermarket car. Whatever money is costed for this proposed extension should be diverted towards measures to lessen or eliminate flooding of the lower castle fields car park. Finally I would add that faith in this council's ability to run services in Tonbridge and Malling is incredibly low (based on election results and anecdotal chatter) and the recent gains by the Green Party has been founded on support for the action they have taken to protect the town's spaces. This proposal will only serve their cause more and I advise councillors to see the political merit in cancelling this proposal if they wish to not cede more power to rival parties.

Off-street response – Reference number 222

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 223

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 224

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 225

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 226

I object to the proposed changes.

Green space is important for the area. Flooding should be a consideration.

Off-street response – Reference number 227

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 228

I object to the proposed changes.

Surely in 2023 we should be encouraging people onto public transport and not denying the hundreds of children that attend Slade and live in the local area a safe green space to play in.

There is a bus strip right by the castle and the train is a 5 minute walk.

Tonbridge castle is a quiet tranquil place for the whole community more car movements brings more pollution to the local area and school and more traffic movements so higher risk to pedestrians. Will the children be expected to walk through a car park rather than safely round the edge? this is not the answer.

Off-street response – Reference number 229

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 231

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 233

I object to the proposed changes.

The grassy area and trees where the extension is proposed is a heavily used route to Slade school. Where children and parents can walk safely to school. The children often use the area to play on after school. There is a large carpark, a min away by the swimming pool, with plenty of parking. No need to expand this car park. We should be encouraging people to walk or use public transport

Off-street response – Reference number 234

I object to the proposed changes.

Absolute waste of money. The car park is rarely full. We will lose lovely green space in an area where green space and trees are so special. The council should be saving money not wasting money where it's not needed. We have so many close by parking areas that should be encouraged not adding them where they are not required. We use that green area with our children nearly everyday as we don't have any garden at home.

Off-street response – Reference number 235

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 238

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 241

I object to the proposed changes.

Concreting over more green space in the town to make way for cars is not sustainable in a world facing a serious climate crisis. It is also not necessary - this car park is rarely at capacity on weekdays. This green space is currently enjoyed by many who are walking and cycling through the town, particularly children from the Slade Primary School who enjoy running through it on their way to the swings nearby. Encouraging more cars to this area only increases the risk to these children, in terms of RTA's and respiratory illness as a result of increased pollution. If this car park is busy, there are plenty of alternatives in the town that are only a short walk from the castle, sportsground, swimming pool or rugby club. When major events are being held, 28 additional spaces will not make a significant difference. Have the council considered alternative options for large events e.g. park-and-ride schemes using electric vehicles and with a revenue share with the landowner that encourages them to use the land in a sustainable way when it is not being used for parking outside of the big events?

Off-street response – Reference number 243

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is used by families with young children whilst waiting for siblings to finish at Slade Primary School. It is used for picnics and creates a clean air area near to the school. We should be dissuading cars from this highly populated area not encouraging more. Leaving the Slade can take ages with queues of cars trying to leave at the same time after school and when there are sports events nearby, Let's not clog up the space even more!

Off-street response – Reference number 245

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 248

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 249

I object to the proposed changes.

It's near a school. More cars more traffic.. more pollution.

Off-street response – Reference number 250

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 251

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 252

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 253

I object to the proposed changes.

Impact on local residents, loss of a playing area useful to parents at pickup and drop off times.
Impact on traffic passing through what are already narrow residential roads. Bigger car park means greater expectation of a place therefore more traffic. And get the Ringo facility working properly with O2 at this site. It's impossible to use.

Off-street response – Reference number 254

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 255

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 256

I object to the proposed changes.

It would encourage more traffic in to a narrow, congested area; there are schoolchildren in close proximity twice a day during term time with pollution and safety implications; it will visually compromise residents' approach to the Castle and remove a significant proportion of the only green space in the Slade.

Off-street response – Reference number 258

I object to the proposed changes.

This would take away the small swings which have been used for generations, also take away the pathway directly from the Castle to Slade primary school,, forcing children to walk adjacent to busy roads.

Off-street response – Reference number 259

I object to the proposed changes.

I regularly use the swings with my son and enjoy the green space.

Off-street response – Reference number 260

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 262

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 263

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 264

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 265

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 266

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 267

I object to the proposed changes.

My children go to Slade school and often play on this bit of green. It's a public open space- it's close to the school and with the amount of time the playground at the Sportsground is flooded- it's often the only place for kids to play. There is a huge car park by the swimming pool just 30seconds walk away- we don't need more concrete!!

Off-street response – Reference number 269

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 270

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 271

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space adjacent to the current car park is well used by local children (especially those attending Slade School) and an extension to the car park would hamper this use and potentially make the walk to school more hazardous for children. The lower castle car park is only a short walk away, with plenty of capacity.

Off-street response – Reference number 272

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 273

I object to the proposed changes.

The area to the west of the current car park is used extensively twice a day by hundreds of school children and their parents attending Slade Primary. It would be dangerous and mean-spirited to put the children's safety in jeopardy and also remove the one piece of open grassland near the school that they can play on before and after school. There are swings at the southern end of the grassland too, which would end up being just next to a car park if the extension goes ahead. It would also make the walk from the Castle Grounds and from the swimming pool area much more dangerous, as the school children would have to walk through a car park to get to Slade School, rather than walk across a pleasant grassy area. The car park's "success" does not mean it should be extended simply because there could be a slightly enhanced revenue stream if it were extended; it is far more important to preserve the small green space next to a primary school and the safe pathway to that school.

Off-street response – Reference number 274

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 275

I object to the proposed changes.

Not necessary. Have always found adequate spaces available

Off-street response – Reference number 276

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 277

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 280

I support the proposed changes.

This space is always full with people using the local amenities

Off-street response – Reference number 281

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 282

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 283

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 284

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 286

I support the proposed changes.

Please however use grass-crete rather than tarmac

Off-street response – Reference number 287

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 288

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 293

I object to the proposed changes.

I feel this is a valued play area for children. Also it's a path area for parents bringing their children to Slade school and now it will have a carpark on it. How is that safe?

Off-street response – Reference number 295

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to green spaces being taken away, this space is an extension to the castle grounds area and children's play space

Off-street response – Reference number 296

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 298

I object to the proposed changes.

You will remove more grassed areas

Off-street response – Reference number 299

I object to the proposed changes.

THIS IS A GREEN SPACE WHICH IS REGULARLY USED FOR PICNICS AND GAMES BY LOACLS AND VISITORS TO THE CASTLE.

AS A SLADE RESIDENT, WE REGULARLY HAVE TROUBLE PARKING OUR CARS IN AN AREA WE HAVE TO BUY PERMITS FOR.

PERMITTED PARKING NEEDS TO BE EXTENDED SO RESIDENTS CAN PARK IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS. THIS ALSO NEEDS MONITORING BY WARDENS. THERE IS FAR TOO MUCH PARKING ON DOUBLE YELLOW LINES AND OUTSIDE SLADE SCHOOL DURING PARK AND CASTLE EVENTS.

Off-street response – Reference number 300

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 301

I support the proposed changes.

More spaces in this car park would be helpful

Off-street response – Reference number 304

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 305

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 308

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 309

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 311

I object to the proposed changes.

I believe there is better use for this green space. Paving over yet more of Tonbridge's town centre is bad for the aesthetic of the town

Off-street response – Reference number 312

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 314

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 315

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 316

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 317

I object to the proposed changes.

This is an important green space used almost everyday by many Slade residents. It adversely affects the environment for the residents of the adjacent Castle Fields retirement complex.

The access road is already overcrowded, with long queues frequently building up on the only road out of The Slade.

Off-street response – Reference number 319

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 320

I object to the proposed changes.

There is no need for this. There are many parking spaces within a short walk of this carpark which are less used - so don't dig up the grass to put more spaces here. People can walk from Lower Castle Field, or Waitrose / Sovereign Way area.

Off-street response – Reference number 322

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is right next to a primary school and would cut right across the current path to school. Additionally, the green space is used by numerous children after school. There is always plenty of parking a short walk away in the lower castle car park

Off-street response – Reference number 324

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the loss of this green space which would further denigrate the centre of Tonbridge.

Off-street response – Reference number 325

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 326

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 329

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 330

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 331

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 332

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 333

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a terrible idea. Please don't do it. The playground is well used. Not sure where the evidence comes from, but on a day to day basis I've ALWAYS been able to park here.

Off-street response – Reference number 334

I object to the proposed changes.

Too many people use this green area so to take it away would be ridiculous. People walking dogs, children playing, people having picnics. Surely, with the modern world being concerned about climate change, taking away green space should be the last thing on the list. There are plenty of other spaces for people to park that are frequently NOT full and are not that long a walk to get to the Castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 336

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 337

I object to the proposed changes.

There is already plenty of car parking space available in Tonbridge. This space could be used to increase biodiversity; something which would be beneficial to the pupils at the primary school nearby as well as the retirement home residents.

Off-street response – Reference number 338

I object to the proposed changes.

Access to central areas by car should be discouraged. Adding more car park spaces in the centre of town only increases traffic. A larger carpark would also make one of the most attractive parts of the town an eyesore. Access for bicycles should instead be encouraged. Leisure centres and sports clubs should especially have the means to be reached safely by bicycle and walking. While not everyone can come by bicycle and foot, a lot of people would if there were facilities for the safe parking of bikes and if it was more safe to get there. Car park spots should really be prioritised for people who live far from the town.

Off-street response – Reference number 340

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 341

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 342

I object to the proposed changes.

I don't want any green space taken away.

Off-street response – Reference number 343

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 344

I object to the proposed changes.

There is already a large amount of traffic into and around the Slade considering this is a fairly small area. As a resident I am regularly struggling to find parking in the residential bays, as people who should be using the car park then park in resident bays when it is permitted. In addition the parking on a Sunday in dangerous locations is not regulated and can potentially cause accidents.

On a school day parents of Slade school park in the residents bays, for at times more than an hour, and then I have been forced to park in the car park which I then have to pay for.

I feel it should be the responsibility of the council to ensure people directed to other car parks within the town rather than take away from the beauty of a picturesque area with adding more concrete and parking bays and take away the green space.

The proposed parking is closer to the play area which is currently in place and many people do utilise this and the surrounding green space regularly and the residents of the Slade area appreciate this area. The addition of the parking in this area is totally unnecessary

Off-street response – Reference number 345

I object to the proposed changes.

Lack of green space

Off-street response – Reference number 346

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 348

I object to the proposed changes.

Both Slade school children and local residents regularly use the swings.

By adding parking to the area by the swings you will be taking away public amenities.

The main park is consistently flooded and therefore unusable most winter months and the swings are used all year round by parents and children after and before school.

Also by creating more parking in that area you will be creating a huge danger to children walking to and from school.

An awful idea in a time where we need more green space.

Spend the money on converting the old Beales and Sainsbury's site not taking away from the community green spaces!!!

Off-street response – Reference number 349

I object to the proposed changes.

Green space is precious and is being chipped away at across Tonbridge. Improve public transport and cycle routes and encourage people to use alternative methods of travel.

Off-street response – Reference number 350

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 351

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 353

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 355

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 357

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 358

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 360

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 361

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 362

I object to the proposed changes.

The space is used by children to play. It's access for lots of children to walk from slade area and school to castle and town.

Off-street response – Reference number 363

I object to the proposed changes.

We are trying to encourage more public transport or walking. This is the opposite. Better public transport would help.

Off-street response – Reference number 364

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 365

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 366

I object to the proposed changes.

There is a very well used pathway through the car park, providing access for residents to the high street, swimming pool, sports ground and castle and the children's play area is also very well used by children from Slade School and residents children. This path appears to be non-existent on the draft plan and with more cars and less path/grass area, I can see a safety issue developing.

Off-street response – Reference number 368

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 371

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is used by children from the nearby Slade School to play after school. It is wholly inappropriate to convert it into additional parking.

Off-street response – Reference number 374

I object to the proposed changes.

I walk to and from the High Street on the path that runs alongside the Upper Castle Field carpark several times a week and I have to tell you that there are always families and young people enjoying the grassy space. There are picnics, ball games, frisbee throwing, conversations on the bench, birthday celebrations, dog walking and queues for the ever popular swings. Small children flood back and forth twice a day on their journeys to and from school. The housing developments that have been approved in the surrounding area mean it is now densely inhabited by people who live in homes with little or no garden space; this patch of land is vital for their physical and mental health. Swallowing up another swathe of green in a money-making venture such as has been suggested is short-sighted, heartless and unpopular.

Off-street response – Reference number 375

I object to the proposed changes.

Green spaces are more important. Public transport should be encouraged rather than taking away green spaces and childrens play areas

Off-street response – Reference number 376

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 378

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 379

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 381

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 382

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 383

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 384

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 385

I object to the proposed changes.

Small children play there - please don't remove every blade of grass, swings and everything else. We don't need more parking, fewer cars.

Off-street response – Reference number 388

I object to the proposed changes.

If this takes away the swings then it's highly disappointing as there always well used

Off-street response – Reference number 389

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 390

I object to the proposed changes.

It's an area children use why add more parking spaces when the lower castle car park has so many

Off-street response – Reference number 391

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 392

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 393

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 394

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 395

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 396

I support the proposed changes.

Although it would be beneficial to put the prices down slightly as the increase in revenue from the new spaces would offset any reduction. This would be really great for the local community and ensure people can have a great day out without it costing an arm and a leg.

Off-street response – Reference number 397

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 398

I object to the proposed changes.

This is an invaluable green space that is in constant daily use by everyone living in The Slade, in particular by families with very young children and must not be lost.

Off-street response – Reference number 399

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 402

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 404

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 405

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 407

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 408

I object to the proposed changes.

The grass area from swings at one end to the Slade school at the other has always been a much needed and enjoyed Facility. I object in the strongest terms.

Off-street response – Reference number 409

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 412

I object to the proposed changes.

The area considered is next to a school where children play on the green daily. Stop taking our green spaces, the car park is not full all day every day, I see the car park daily so no need to make it bigger.

Off-street response – Reference number 413

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 414

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 415

I object to the proposed changes.

More cars means more climate impact: this proposal would encourage more driving and parking. TMBC should be campaigning and incentivising people to walk or cycle. Safety (cars and quality of air): this proposal would encourage more cars to drive and park near a school, a swimming pool, a river slipway, a rugby club, a public park used by community football. It gets very busy at school transition times, at sports fixture times and when it's nice weather and people access the river. It's majority single lane access off the high street and there is then sitting congestion increasing safety risk and reducing air quality. TMBC should looking at a longer term strategy to tackle that congestion rather than potentially adding to it. TMBC should be campaigning and incentivising people to walk or cycle.

Walking and playing: children and their careers walk to and from school via the proposed route. This proposal reduces their opportunity to access a safe walking route. It also reduces access to a safe space the children play before or after school (primary & secondary children). This potentially reduces air quality next to the established play area.

The proposed route also reduces an established walking route into Tonbridge town via Tonbridge Castle.

Events at Tonbridge Castle also use this footpath for queuing to help with event management.

TMBC should be campaigning and incentivising people to walk or cycle.

Off-street response – Reference number 418

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 419

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 420

I object to the proposed changes.

I think it would be better to review this after new car parking charges are brought in. More charges may discourage people from parking there. It is also a well used area of grass by local children.

Off-street response – Reference number 421

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 422

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 423

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 424

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 428

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 430

I object to the proposed changes.

Please do not add more concrete to our town,

Off-street response – Reference number 431

I object to the proposed changes.

The Lower Castle carpark provides adequate space. Extending Upper Castle would destroy the green space

Off-street response – Reference number 432

I object to the proposed changes.

I have lived in the Slade for many years and walk past this patch of grass frequently. The whole patch of grass is very well used by children playing games, all ages sitting on the bench chatting, picnics and if course the swings. It is particularly popular at before and after school. This is a very well used community resource and I think it would be wrong to remove it.

Off-street response – Reference number 434

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 435

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 437

I object to the proposed changes.

It is very rare that parking cannot be found in Tonbridge so destroying a well loved and well used green space for cars is highly objectionable. Perhaps TMBC should focus on non-car based transport options.

Off-street response – Reference number 439

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 440

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 444

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 445

I object to the proposed changes.

There is usually space at lower castle field. It's not much further to walk. Green space used by children on the way to school.

Off-street response – Reference number 446

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 448

I object to the proposed changes.

Yet more green space lost to the car! I strongly suspect it's just a revenue collection scheme!

Off-street response – Reference number 452

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 453

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 455

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 456

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 457

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space provides a valuable resource for the people of The Slade. Our children use it regularly during the summer for cricket football and just relaxing. The swings are a popular facility and rarely unoccupied in fine weather. Families from the Slade primary school also use it, as do visitors to the area to relax. On a very personal level my children and their friends spent many happy days and evenings there and I'm sure that I'm not alone in saying that it provides many happy memories.

While you may wish to make more money, and facilitate paying Visitors to the castle, surely as our council your priority should be with us the residents and must not destroy this much loved green space. There is plenty of parking in Tonbridge if visitors are prepared to walk..and who knows spend money in the town.

I must emphasise my deep opposition to this plan which I know is shared by my neighbours.

Off-street response – Reference number 460

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 461

I support the proposed changes.

It's well used, so that makes sense.

Off-street response – Reference number 464

I object to the proposed changes.

There is plenty of parking in this area and the green space is used by children and adults alike.

Off-street response – Reference number 465

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 466

I object to the proposed changes.

This would be awful for the town and protection must be put in place for green open spaces.

Off-street response – Reference number 468

I object to the proposed changes.

The Upper Castle Field play area provides a space for children and their families to play and get together, it is also one of the main pathways for children who go to Slade School to walk to and from school. It is the next best space for children to play in when the Tonbridge Race Course Park is flooded, which it always is for 3 months of the year. I am completely against the extension of the Upper Field car park, it is causing our 5 year old daughter quite a lot of distress thinking about an area she loves to play in being taken away from her. As residents of the Slade area and our daughter being a pupil at Slade School, we are very unhappy about this proposal and hope it is not successful in taking place.

Off-street response – Reference number 471

I object to the proposed changes.

It would be a shame to lose the green grassy area with the swings. It's used by children from Slade School and supports safe walking to school. More spaces would encourage people to drive to the school

Off-street response – Reference number 472

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the extension of the castle car park as this will impinge on the existing limited green space that adds to the character surrounding the castle, make the route for elderly people walking to the castle or high street from the Slade less direct, and make it less safe for children using the play area.

Off-street response – Reference number 474

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is for the children to enjoy a bit of downtime after school with their friends please don't be selfish and take it away from them.

Also the pathway is a route for the older children in the top end of the school to get more confidence on walking on their own ready for secondary school.

Off-street response – Reference number 475

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 477

I object to the proposed changes.

As above

Off-street response – Reference number 478

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 480

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 481

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space is as well used as the carpark and as such would be a great loss. Many children use this as a safe route to Slade school away from the road and it is a valuable play space for children before and after school. It is because of this that I object. I appreciate that the carpark generates revenue but I believe the loss of this space outweighs the benefits of your proposal.

Off-street response – Reference number 487

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 488

I object to the proposed changes.

I strongly object the plans to extend the Upper Castle Car Park. It may be a busy car park but the Lower Castle car park is only around the corner and is not always full. Why do we need more spaces when the Lower Castle Car Park is not fully used. Children often play on the green area, which will be significantly reduced by the plans and the swings are very popular. Having green space for children to play is vitally important for their mental health and well being and this should be priority over more car park spaces. It is a nice green space by the Castle so making the car park bigger will decrease the aesthetics of the Castle and result in the removal of trees. There is a pathway across the green area that children use to walk safely to Slade School and who are greeted by the Lollipop Person to help them to cross the road safely. What will be the alternative route for these children to walk to school? Will this impact on where they cross the road and require additional Lollipop Person at a different location? If so this is unfair on the school and a different route will potentially be more unsafe for the children. This plans are led by the need to make money but I do not feel this should come at the expense of green areas that are valued and used by the community being lost.

Off-street response – Reference number 490

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 491

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 492

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 496

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 497

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 498

(no comment supplied)

I don't know enough about this issue to comment

Off-street response – Reference number 499

I object to the proposed changes.

The swings and grass area are well used by those using the car park and local residents and school children. The change from green area to parking will also change the aesthetics of the area which are currently pleasant and in keeping with the heritage of the Castle. There are plenty of other car parks with 5-10 minutes walk of the castle and the addition of 28 spaces won't make that much difference during peak times (i.e. large events).

Slade parents have to use the lower car park so do not affect the demands on the Upper Castle car park.

Off-street response – Reference number 500

I object to the proposed changes.

This would be valuable green space lost in a town rapidly building on any area. It also loses the swings which children use al

The time

Off-street response – Reference number 501

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 502

I object to the proposed changes.

There are plenty of parking spaces in car parks near by and this green space next to the castle is a safe pedestrian route for people going to/from Slade School and Slade area. More parking spaces encourages people to use their cars instead of local public transport where the money would be better spent and is better for the environment.

Off-street response – Reference number 503

I object to the proposed changes.

The area around the castle is one of the town's best features, as is in near constant use by families and children through the day. I think this space should be for people, not more space for cars that already dominate the town

Off-street response – Reference number 507

I object to the proposed changes.

A green space area and highly used footpath would be destroyed to extend the car park. Assume the swings would also be removed which would be a shame.

Off-street response – Reference number 509

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 512

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 514

I object to the proposed changes.

I strongly object to this, a lot of the Slade children safely play in this space before and after school. It offers an area where the children can let off steam, socialising with their friends. This is especially important for those without outside space at home. Please do not allow parking in this space.

Off-street response – Reference number 518

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 519

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 523

I object to the proposed changes.

Please leave the swings alone and the pathway. This is a safe space for children

Off-street response – Reference number 525

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 530

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 531

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 534

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to this as there would be no safe path for members of the public to use going down towards Slade school, plus you cannot use the path behind this as it's just not suitable and appropriate.

The use of the swings are a delight for many children and this would make this more dangerous.

Off-street response – Reference number 536

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 537

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 538

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 539

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 540

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 541

I object to the proposed changes.

Cut local events rather than blight local residents with increased traffic. Putting in extra spaces not the answer. Unfair that weekends packed with traffic.

Off-street response – Reference number 542

I support the proposed changes.

Brilliant idea! Especially as busy events at Castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 544

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 545

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space in town is precious. It should be protected in a beautiful and historic area. The swings are well used and would suffer from being engulfed by concrete and more engine fumes. Green space is also regularly used by Slade primary school children after school. Would ruin an outdoor space for children.

Off-street response – Reference number 546

I object to the proposed changes.

I thought the use of public transport was to be encouraged, not by providing more and more car parking spaces! Please do not tarmac this land. Flatten the empty Beales store and use that!

Off-street response – Reference number 547

I support the proposed changes.

Object to charges.

Off-street response – Reference number 548

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 550

I object to the proposed changes.

It would be such a shame to lose the grassy area to extend the upper castle field car park. This area is used extensively by all members of the slade community. Many primary school children and parents gather there every day to use the swings, socialise, play, have picnics. It would be a massive loss, and also really undermine the whole look of Tonbridge Castle. It would also really send the wrong message and encourage more people to use their cars and contribute further to the already terrible traffic congestion/pollution in town. We do not need more parking or cars in Tonbridge. We need better/cheaper public transports, more cycle paths and pedestrian areas!!

Off-street response – Reference number 552

I object to the proposed changes.

This is just another step to the War on drivers, If you wish to raise capital without increasing Residents Council Tax, I suggest the council takes a strategic look at the corporate directors team who really run the council, Highly paid unelected individuals

Off-street response – Reference number 554

I object to the proposed changes.

We should not be turning Green space, used by families and children, into a car park. For most of the year there is plenty of parking spaces, for a few weeks a year these proposals cannot be justified.

Off-street response – Reference number 556

I object to the proposed changes.

I strongly object. This is an unnecessary land grab that would impact on recreation and on the appearance of the castle surrounds. We have surplus spaces available in the town with several car parks often empty on sovereign way. The answer to making the town a better place to live and work simply cannot be paving more and more land for cars.

Off-street response – Reference number 557

I object to the proposed changes.

Unnecessary encroachment on land. An enormous car park 3mins walk away

Off-street response – Reference number 558

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 562

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 563

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 564

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 565

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 566

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 570

I object to the proposed changes.

This will take away safe route of walking for local pupils to the school! It is a much used green space by children, with the swings always in use. It will reduce and impact the local wildlife environment! With being able to use the gateway car parking spaces as well, is this really necessary?

Off-street response – Reference number 571

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 572

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 573

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 574

I object to the proposed changes.

The Upper Castle Field green space adjacent to the current parking area is a well-loved and well-used small green area frequented often by Slade resident families, and parents and children on their way to and from the Slade school as a recreation area in a safe place. Many Slade residents, including my family here in the Fosse, have spent happy hours with our children on the swings, picnicking, pushing a ball around or often just stopping with small children for repose and some run around on the grass time, on our way to and from the town. To pave over this beloved patch of lawn and turn it into concrete and parking is a regressive proposal which would have an instant negative impact on families in the area, and using the area as a thoroughfare. This grassy slope is a source of great respite for mothers with small children, as it is a compact but secure space which provides a stop-off point where children can recreate and let off some energy, while mothers - or fathers - regroup. The greater sized Tonbridge Park itself, whilst having its strengths for older families and adults, is vast in scope and the 'play areas' contain some play equipment too advanced for small children. These play areas in Tonbridge Park are also often monopolised by teenagers, especially in out-of-school hours, whereas this little green is preferred by young families with toddlers and young children, within a discreet perimeter where children can be easily monitored. The small set of swings on the Upper Castle Fields is perfect and manageable for small children and it is a gift to parents. There are other parking spaces in Tonbridge within very easy reach of the town - the swimming pool car park for example provides just as easy access to the town and activities at the castle.

Another consideration which is being overlooked is the aesthetics of the immediate Castle area. Tonbridge Castle is the Jewel in the Crown of Tonbridge. The approach to the castle up this small but beautiful family-friendly grassy slope gives a natural and pleasing overture to the Castle on the Slade side of its aspect. Visitors and residents choosing to approach the Castle and the Town from this direction are invited in via a healthy and vibrant green space, and the constant presence of families

and small children in this space in itself is a signal of the values of the town. I can think of no more wholesome advertisement for a country market town than that it treasures its family-friendly green recreational spaces, however small, and however close in proximity to the hub of activity in the town. In fact, it is this proximity which is why the Upper Castle Field green space is so unique and special, and held in such high regard by children and especially thankful parents. It is also not insignificant that bordering on to this beloved green area are assisted living flats for elderly Tonbridge residents, who currently have the pleasure of views from their windows of a delightful green space dotted with families with small children gathering, socialising, relaxing and playing. To replace this space with concrete and cars seems an insult to these elderly local residents and all they have contributed to their local area.

So I and my family at (REDACTED) object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to extend the parking at Upper Castle Fields, which would involve the concretisation and obliteration of a much used and much treasured green space which is both the delight and the salvation of young families, precisely because of where it is and because of its unique and highly treasured qualities. This small, special green space must be properly understood, valued, and preserved.

(REDACTED)

Off-street response – Reference number 575

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 576

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 577

I support the proposed changes.

If it's free at the point of use.

Off-street response – Reference number 581

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 582

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 584

I support the proposed changes.

Free drop off /collection 30 minute window for Slade. Free 1 hour parking in TMBC

Off-street response – Reference number 585

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 586

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 589

I object to the proposed changes.

I understand that TMBC is very short of funds but once an asset such as open space is lost from the town it is gone forever. From the map of the proposed extension to Castle Upper Field car park it shows parking taking over more than half of the open grass space which is currently there. It seems, too, that the footpath from the Slade to the Castle will go straight through the middle of the car park. I don't think that is a particularly safe option for primary school children to get to school. That piece of grass looks like nothing on a map but it is a valued, much-loved resource for people in the Slade Area and for families using Slade primary school. A go on the swings on the way to or from school or to the park, family picnics, football and cricket games, sitting looking towards the Castle all take place there. The remaining grass and the patch round the swings is hardly going to be a conducive or safe environment for families with small children.

Extending the car park will not solve the over-parking in the area on sports occasions in the park or events at the Castle. What might help is if every event gives information to those attending that there are lots of car parks within easy walking distance from the park and the Castle - Sovereign Way, Sainsburys, Waitrose. Some of these car parks are not full most of the time and it has been proposed (I think) that one of the Sovereign Way car parks should be sold off for building. Part of the station car park has two floors, why not the whole car park? Why is travel by train not encouraged or group travel for visiting sports teams. 28 additional parking spaces and in exchange a pleasant, well-used green space is ruined. I object.

Off-street response – Reference number 591

I object to the proposed changes.

Tonbridge is in need of a boost to trade and visitors, not discourage even further.

Off-street response – Reference number 592

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 593

I object to the proposed changes.

This is our green space, once it has gone, it won't be back. It's completely unacceptable to extend the car park here. It's used by the community, the school, the children who have been to swimming pool, waiting for friends, walking the dog.

There are huge amounts of parking available at similar walking distance. It's not about the parking spaces. Spaces are not at a premium, you need to educate instead. Cycle, walk, car share, public transport should be encouraged.

The car parks by back of sovereign way could be more publicised, they are not full. Why are we having our green space threatened when the other car parks are nowhere near full?

People love to walk round this place because there are trees and hedges, small wildlife. This area is used by our community, picnics, playing football, cricket, playing on way to school.

We have a beautiful area here, enriched by the heritage of the castle. I honestly can not believe this has been proposed, so near to the ancient monument. It should be protected.

You are supposed to be encouraging green ways of transportation, not encouraging more people to use cars. Visiting the town is not about destroying our green space, most visitors are looking for the history. Concrete and tarmac are not our future here.

Off-street response – Reference number 594

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 597

I support the proposed changes.

Payment machines must accept cash

Off-street response – Reference number 598

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 599

(no comment supplied)

Ditto

Off-street response – Reference number 601

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 603

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 604

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 608

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 610

I object to the proposed changes.

This is an outrageous suggestion. Many children play in that area after school and would no longer have a safe place to play. We have just moved to The Slade and regularly use this area for our 2 year old to ride his bike and run around safely. It's greedy to use green spaces like this for more parking. I have lived in Tonbridge my whole life and have never had an issue parking somewhere. Disgusting suggestion from someone who has no clue about the area.

Off-street response – Reference number 611

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a lovely green space and loved by many. The car park is only busy now and again and we have enough car parks all around Tonbridge. This would be an absolute disgrace to extend and lose even more loved land. Idiomatic to even think it in a prime centre site

Off-street response – Reference number 612

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 613

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 614

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the proposed change.

Currently, the green beside the car park is used by residents and visitors to play games and enjoy greenery.

Currently, this is a path used by residents and schoolchildren to cut through from the High Street and Castle. It will become dangerous if the space is used by the carpark.

I question extension of the ground square meterage. Why not to have a second floor built instead? I would imagine the current parking area to be a ground level with an additional underground level built straight beneath it.

Off-street response – Reference number 615

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 616

I object to the proposed changes.

I object on the basis that this is a Green space that is well used by children after school and at weekends, and it would be a shame to lose this. There is usually space in the lower castle car park which just involves walking an extra minute.

Off-street response – Reference number 617

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 618

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 621

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 622

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 623

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 624

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 625

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 627

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 628

I object to the proposed changes.

Near play area for public which many children use

Off-street response – Reference number 630

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 631

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 632

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 633

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 636

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 642

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 644

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 645

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 649

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 652

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 654

I object to the proposed changes.

Town is already getting a kicking because of parking people just go to bluewater and shop

Off-street response – Reference number 668

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 673

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 675

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 677

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 682

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 683

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 684

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 686

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 689

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 692

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 693

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 696

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 698

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 699

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 702

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 703

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 705

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 706

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 708

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 709

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 710

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 722

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 726

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 732

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 733

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 736

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 746

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 747

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 750

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 752

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 757

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 760

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 764

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 769

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 772

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 774

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 776

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 778

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 779

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 782

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 783

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 784

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 785

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 786

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 793

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 794

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 795

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 796

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 799

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 800

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 801

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 809

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 813

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 814

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 815

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 823

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 826

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 829

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 830

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 831

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 832

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 844

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 850

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 854

I object to the proposed changes.

I object only because of the funding issue. This is a time when councils everywhere are struggling for money.

Off-street response – Reference number 856

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 859

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 861

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 865

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 866

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 867

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 871

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 873

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 874

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 875

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 880

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 883

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 884

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 887

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 890

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 895

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 896

I support the proposed changes.

As per the above Tonbridge needs more car parking.

Off-street response – Reference number 898

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 899

I object to the proposed changes.

Unfortunately, it is not true that the castle car park is well used. During weekends especially, visitors choose to park on double yellow lines (and all other available bits of space) around Slade area whilst there are (VISIBLE) spaces available at the car park - they choose to avoid paying for parking. The new addition to the town - Illumintae caused havoc during their opening night.

No traffic wardens are there during weekends and late nights - what is the point of introducing new paid area? It will only encourage more visitors who will still be parking dangerously.

So adding up 30 parking spaces won't change much around here - if you decided to spend your money on a new car park - invest in a multi-storey one near Sainsbury.

I don't think this proposal considers safety of the Slade area residents - it's purely for the income. Green areas in Tonbridge are shrinking - find another way of extending parking spaces around here,

other towns manage somehow (see Tunbridge Wells).

Off-street response – Reference number 901

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 902

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 910

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 914

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 920

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 922

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 928

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 929

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 931

I object to the proposed changes.

As above.

Off-street response – Reference number 932

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 933

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 935

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 938

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 940

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 942

I object to the proposed changes.

I object in a huge way to this idea to extend the car park here. Not only do the children all play on the patch of grass on the way to & from school every day, but it is used as the school run. The proposed plan to disconnect the area of swings to the grass at the bottom will be extremely dangerous for the children as they will run into the car park!!! Central Tonbridge is beautiful & we need to protect all the green spaces not concrete them for the sake of a few events & weekend football overflow from lower castle field. Surely extending one of the many car parks near Sainsbury's would be a far better idea in an already concrete area to provide footfall to the dying high street. It's only a 2 min walk for people!!! Please don't take away the much loved green space in this precious area. I don't know one person with a family who would want this. Families make up a huge part of Tonbridge. People can park elsewhere!

Off-street response – Reference number 947

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 949

(no comment supplied)

No comment

Off-street response – Reference number 951

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 954

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 955

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 957

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 958

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 963

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 964

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 965

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 968

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 972

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 974

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 979

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 980

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 983

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 987

I object to the proposed changes.

The proposal appears to be a lot of effort for what must be a small gain in a few spaces. Surely the amount spent will wipe out any gain for a very long time.

Off-street response – Reference number 988

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 991

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 998

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 999

I support the proposed changes.

As long as the playground is unaffected.

Off-street response – Reference number 1000

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1001

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1007

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1013

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1014

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1016

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1017

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1018

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1019

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1021

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1023

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1024

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1028

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1029

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1030

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1031

I object to the proposed changes.

The land that would be used for the extension is intensely used by the children from Slade school when they get out of school. The swings that they use would find themselves surrounded by cars, which would be both unsafe and unhealthy. There is also a path used by all Slade people. We also think that people should be discouraged from using their cars. We want cleaner air. There are other existing car parks in town within a 5 min. Walk from the castle that people can use. The castle is also easily reached by public transport. In fact, what we'd want to see is discounts for castle visits and events for people who've come by public transport.

Off-street response – Reference number 1033

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1037

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1039

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1046

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1049

(no comment supplied)

Not my area

Off-street response – Reference number 1056

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1058

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1062

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1067

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1071

I object to the proposed changes.

The grass around this car park softens the appearance of the car park enabling the area to maintain a more natural ambiance whilst still providing parking facilities. The swings on the grass are well used by local children on the way to and from school, during school times and also during school holidays. It would be a real shame for this facility to be lost from this area. Further, the benches on the grass are also well used. There are usually plenty of parking spaces available in other areas of the town (i.e. back of sainsburys / sovereign way car parks) where people could park as an alternative without the need to needlessly destroy a well used grassy area.

Off-street response – Reference number 1073

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1074

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1076

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1078

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1089

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1095

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1096

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1099

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1100

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1101

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1102

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1103

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1104

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1107

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1109

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1112

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1120

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1128

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1135

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1138

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1141

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1144

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1147

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1149

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1152

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1161

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1164

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1166

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1167

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1170

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1172

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1173

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1176

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1180

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1181

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1187

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1195

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1196

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1197

I object to the proposed changes.

Absolutely ridiculous in my opinion it's just another way to make money especially as there is no free time ect 30mins the fact you're happy to charge people already struggling for the first 30min proves it all about making money!!! Nothing to do with lack of spaces never had a problem parking all this does is stop people using shops already struggling

Off-street response – Reference number 1198

I object to the proposed changes.

This area of grassland is used by Parents and children of Slade Primary School before and after school. To tarmac over it will be a shame for the children, and put them at greater risk as they walk and cycle to and from school.

Off-street response – Reference number 1205

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1206

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1207

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1208

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1225

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1227

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1228

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1229

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1230

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1236

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1237

I object to the proposed changes.

Especially if it will be on the site of the current children's play area.

Off-street response – Reference number 1244

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1245

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1248

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1249

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1250

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1251

I support the proposed changes.

Is it possible to make sure there is a footpath around the car park and not through it for the safety of parents and children walking to and from Slade School, and others. Please retain the swings.

Off-street response – Reference number 1257

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1259

I object to the proposed changes.

By removing parts of the play area, the facilities used by Slade school children letting off steam both before and after school will both be significantly reduced but also dangerous.

Off-street response – Reference number 1268

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1270

I object to the proposed changes.

Any extension will impact on the local, we'll established flora and fauna.

Off-street response – Reference number 1271

I support the proposed changes.

Great for local business in town , should hopefully bring more customers

Off-street response – Reference number 1273

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1274

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1275

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1277

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1284

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1285

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1288

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1290

I object to the proposed changes.

This would cover a lovely green area where children often play. There are plenty enough other options that simply need better signage

Off-street response – Reference number 1294

I object to the proposed changes.

This area of land is used daily by children from neighbouring schools. It's a hugely important outside space for children and their parents to congregate before and after school. I see children playing football, chase and other games, learning important social rules. Losing this would significantly impact their social lives. It would also create more traffic in an area that is already busy. Additionally there are another two car parks 30 seconds around the corner near Tonbridge swimming pool which are never full. So another car park is unnecessary. Children's health and wellbeing should be prioritised.

Off-street response – Reference number 1298

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1301

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1303

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1306

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1307

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1312

I object to the proposed changes.

The area of greenery around the current car park is enjoyed by all. Children stop at the swings on way to & from slade school. There is plenty of other car parks around for people to use.

Off-street response – Reference number 1313

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1314

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1318

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1322

I object to the proposed changes.

I'm not happy that this would mean taking away valuable green space. If it does go ahead I would like to see the swings remain because they are in constant use. In fact a few more would be of great benefit to families.

Off-street response – Reference number 1323

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1326

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1328

I support the proposed changes.

Although I support the extension, please consider ways to reduce fast water flow off, by building it an eco friendly manner. Also you must retain a pedestrian path as it is the busiest pathway link between the Slade and the castle area and town.

Off-street response – Reference number 1332

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1334

I object to the proposed changes.

The area is within Tonbridge Conservation Area and an extension of the car park would detract from that. The area borders a school and a residential development for elderly citizens. Both children and older people are disproportionately affected by poor air quality which will be made worse by the

extension of the car park. The argument that the parking revenue here is the highest and so we need to build more spaces is illogical, there are many car parking spaces available within a short distance, what barrier is there to increasing charges at the other sites to match this one? This area of grass has been put forward for increasing biodiversity by local councillors, it is a carbon asset and valued by the local community especially the Slade School.

Off-street response – Reference number 1335

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1336

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1338

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1340

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1344

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1349

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1350

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1354

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1357

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1359

I object to the proposed changes.

Don't get rid of the green kids place and have picnics on it!

Off-street response – Reference number 1361

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1362

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1363

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1364

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1365

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1366

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1367

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1369

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1370

I support the proposed changes.

Great idea

Off-street response – Reference number 1371

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1373

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a lovely green space which is well used by families and provides a pleasant green buffer zone in a built up area.

Off-street response – Reference number 1374

I support the proposed changes.

Provide the option for very short term parking if it is used for school drop offs eg. 20 minutes

Ensure the pay and display machines enable payment with a debit card.

Off-street response – Reference number 1375

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1376

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1378

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1379

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1380

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1382

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1383

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1385

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1387

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1391

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1393

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1395

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1397

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1399

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1402

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1403

I object to the proposed changes.

Before this car park is extended surely it would be better to have better signage around the town for the other car parks in Sovereign way etc so that visitors can easily find their way to those car parks. May be also have finger signage for pedestrians to know how long it takes to walk from say the Angel car park to the castle.

Keeping as much of this green space is very important to Slade Residents as it is used everyday by all ages and visitors.

Off-street response – Reference number 1404

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1405

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1406

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1409

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1410

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1411

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1412

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1415

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1417

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space surrounding the car park is regularly used by families for leisure activities.

Off-street response – Reference number 1422

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1426

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1427

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1428

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1429

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1430

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a place of peace and quiet, where children like to play after school away from the main park. Also this will cause noise and disturbance for the residents of Castle Fields, my mother is one of

those residents.

Off-street response – Reference number 1431

I support the proposed changes.

As much as I hate seeing green space concreted over, this is the most logical place to extend parking and the green is very rarely used by anyone.

Off-street response – Reference number 1432

I object to the proposed changes.

As a society we should be doing everything to discourage car journeys. Better cycling options and public transport. By making it easier to park you are encouraging a behaviour that we should be trying to stop. This is largely typical behaviour of a council that are not thinking sustainability first. We want less cars, better infrastructure, less pollution and safer areas to cycle and walk. We should be encouraging this for our future generations.

Off-street response – Reference number 1434

I object to the proposed changes.

We should discourage car use. Don't tarmac over green space to encourage more driving. Didn't TMBC declare a climate emergency?

Off-street response – Reference number 1435

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1436

I support the proposed changes.

Win for visitors and a win for TMBC

Off-street response – Reference number 1437

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1439

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a green space enjoyed by users of the car park for impromptu picnics in the summer months. The car park is full during events but will be regardless of any additional space. The adjacent swimming pool car parks should be reviewed and made more efficient and signposted better.

Off-street response – Reference number 1441

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1443

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a green space enjoyed by many, there's plenty of other car parks around the town like lower castle fields which is rarely full.

Off-street response – Reference number 1444

I support the proposed changes.

It will enable more people to access parking for Castle events.

Off-street response – Reference number 1445

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1447

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1450

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1451

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1453

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1454

I support the proposed changes.

I welcome the proposal for more parking spaces but see below re charges.

Off-street response – Reference number 1456

I object to the proposed changes.

Children from Slade school walk across this grassy area all the time. They also play there. Is the current parking fully utilised since there are no banks for people park and use anymore.

Off-street response – Reference number 1457

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1464

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1468

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1471

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1472

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1474

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1476

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1477

I object to the proposed changes.

We should be keeping green space, not removing it with more tarmac.

Off-street response – Reference number 1478

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1481

I object to the proposed changes.

It makes no sense to tarmac over green space when we should save as much as we can.

Off-street response – Reference number 1483

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1484

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1486

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1487

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1488

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1489

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1490

I object to the proposed changes.

You only need to see how the green is used by all the children and families around school time to know how unsafe an idea this is. This is where kids run around and let off steam before and after school, and families stop for snacks and picnics. And quite frankly the grass takes the slack from the narrow path for people to be able to walk to and from the high street via the castle as it can get very busy at times (including when all the events are put on at the castle). It's also one of the few green spaces around here that doesn't flood in heavy rain so is more important to preserve it as it is, so there is always somewhere for kids to run and play.

Off-street response – Reference number 1495

I support the proposed changes.

Although I understand the car parking charging are a significant part of the Council's income, however, Council must consider all the negative effect of introducing more car parking charges, which are arguably, already overburdening many of the residents. The car parking charges affect local businesses as the residents tend to buy things online fearing the charges they have to pay to be in the town. It affects mental health of all age-group who are not able to come in to the town due to the parking charge rates. There are so many medical studies supporting these and I am happy to get you the evidence on request.

In principle, there should be more space for the residents to park cars in Tonbridge and less charges. The increase in charges is a false economy as it destroys the high street businesses. No wonder on Tonbridge High Street, most new shops that have opened in the last few years are charity shops. Many of the brands have actually closed and no new brand that matter has joined.

Off-street response – Reference number 1497

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1498

I object to the proposed changes.

I agree more parking is needed in this area. A separate proposal to provide paid for parking separately for users of the river, with a new slipway available will ease the existing congestion in this area of town and enable more visitors to enjoy the river and access the town from paddleboards, canoes & kayaks. This will enable businesses to enjoy more visitors and provide what visitors want, easy access to the River Medway.

Off-street response – Reference number 1500

I support the proposed changes.

In essence I have no objections to residents getting permits or increasing the number of pay and display bays. However If you make these car parks more expensive for the general commuter more people will use the few roads around Tonbridge that are not permitted - mine being one. This is frustrating, annoying and unsafe on these roads and always feels like an anomaly. I would welcome residents permits on all roads to combat this and then make the formalised car parks cheaper to local nearby residents but more expensive to others.

Off-street response – Reference number 1504

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1505

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1506

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1509

I object to the proposed changes.

Focus should be to encourage people not to use their cars by providing improved public transport

Off-street response – Reference number 1510

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is completely unsuitable to use as a car park as it is on an incline and fumes created will go straight into Slade School putting children's health at risk. It is also near to a senior residents' home so will put their health at risk, again with the fumes.

Off-street response – Reference number 1517

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1525

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1526

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1528

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1530

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1531

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1532

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1533

I object to the proposed changes.

another nibbling away of green space. flooding possible

Off-street response – Reference number 1534

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is too close to tourist/ castle area. Additional parking would be better along the rugby club / pool area

Off-street response – Reference number 1536

(no comment supplied)

Unable to answer until proposed design available showing what impact there would be.

Off-street response – Reference number 1542

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1543

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1548

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1551

I object to the proposed changes.

This area of grass is regularly used by children and is nearby Slade School. My kids love running across there to get to the swings and would be very disappointing if decide to ruin green areas with concrete for parking.

Off-street response – Reference number 1552

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1553

I object to the proposed changes.

I strongly object. Please, please keep this wonderful space as it is - it is extremely popular with children as well as teenagers and adults. Extending the car park in the proposed area would completely ruin the character of this part of Tonbridge.

Off-street response – Reference number 1554

I object to the proposed changes.

Additional car space will encourage additional traffic.

Off-street response – Reference number 1555

I object to the proposed changes.

The pathway through this carpark is used by the children attending Slade school. If this is closed alternative routes could be dangerous.

Off-street response – Reference number 1556

I object to the proposed changes.

The proposed extension together with the proposed increase of parking charges and the introduction of charges on Sundays will not solve the problem with parking around castle area in Tonbridge but only exacerbate the issue and cause more nuisance to the residents of Slade area. There was clear evidence at the last Illinimate Tonbridge Castle event, that there were lots of empty car spaces in both Upper Castle and Lower Castle car parks, and yet visitors simply left their cars on double yellow lines in The Slade (opposite the car park!) and on the residential car spaces causing obstructions - visitors don't want to pay for the car park if they can simply leave their cars anywhere! Increasing the fees and introducing Sunday fees will only make things worse for the residents.

Off-street response – Reference number 1557

I object to the proposed changes.

The green area is happily used by kids attending Slade school , it's a safe meeting point for them in the mornings and after school. The path next to the existing car park provides a safe walk way for all parents/ kids / school members that walk from the town center to school. The proposal does not take into account the safety of pedestrians and the right of safe passage through the proposed car park extension towards the school.

Off-street response – Reference number 1558

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1559

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1560

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a part of the park with swings that is used by pedestrians and little children. It also is a lovely landscape for the backdrop of the castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 1561

I support the proposed changes.

This is a potentially good idea but pedestrian access should remain (zebra crossings within the car park?) and the swings should also be kept in place as they are often well used.

Off-street response – Reference number 1564

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1565

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1566

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1567

I support the proposed changes.

Increasing spaces should not however become " cluttered " in the area

Off-street response – Reference number 1568

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1569

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1570

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1571

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1572

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to this many children use the path that runs alongside the existing car park and I feel strongly that further extension would increase the risk to children of accidental collisions

Off-street response – Reference number 1573

I support the proposed changes.

It will allow more people to access events at the castle and to shop in the town.

Off-street response – Reference number 1574

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1576

I support the proposed changes.

Whilst I am always sad to see the loss of grass space, which no doubt is used by children, especially before and after school at Slade; and whilst I would rather see more people walking/cycling into town, than driving; I feel that this proposal is a reasonable compromise to increase the overall parking options in the town. Plus, I'm not sure any of the other car parks can be as easily extended.

Off-street response – Reference number 1580

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1582

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1584

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1585

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space next to the car park is regularly used by children in the community and from Slade school. The last thing we should be encouraging near a school is more cars. There are several other car parks in the vicinity there is no need for another. The area / castle is popular because of the surrounding green spaces. Removing this will make it less so. If anything we should be considering removing the car park and replacing it with trees. The congestion in that area during school pick up times is very bad already- encouraging more cars will make it worse. The roads there are already too busy.

Off-street response – Reference number 1586

I support the proposed changes.

Please ensure in doing so you add an extra 1 or 2 disabled spaces

Off-street response – Reference number 1587

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1589

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1592

(no comment supplied)

Don't use so don't know.

Off-street response – Reference number 1593

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1594

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1595

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1599

I object to the proposed changes.

No! It's green space for kids with swings, why can't people walk down to lower fields? It's in a residential area with a school opposite why would u take this away from the kids? Or make it more dangerous with more cars?

Off-street response – Reference number 1600

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1601

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1602

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1603

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1605

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1608

I object to the proposed changes.

Protect the green spaces that remain

Off-street response – Reference number 1610

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1612

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1613

I object to the proposed changes.

a small number of local businesses that are struggling with the increase costs of operating their businesses. The introduction of parking charges will lead to a reduction in footfall which will further impact on their ability to keep operating. Consequently some businesses will close leaving empty spaces as per most high streets.

Off-street response – Reference number 1614

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1615

I object to the proposed changes.

I don't see the need to extend this carpark when all the other town parking can easily be used to access the park and swimming pool. They are not much further away and have plenty of spaces.

This area close to the castle and in the Slade conservation area should be preserved at all costs. Other carparks could be increased if necessary, before this one.

Off-street response – Reference number 1617

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1618

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1622

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1624

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space is used everyday especially on school days by the children of Slade school after school and by many families at other times. To destroy this small yet vital green space crowding the children's swings is senseless, especially when with increased pricing fewer spaces will be needed. It could also be used for additional event space being so close to the Castle....

Off-street response – Reference number 1625

I object to the proposed changes.

1. Concerned re the interruption of the footpath leading to/from the Castle,
2. Concerned re removal of more green space and its replacement by more asphalt.

Off-street response – Reference number 1627

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1628

I support the proposed changes.

Please re-site the children's play area to the remaining grass area.

Off-street response – Reference number 1631

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1632

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1633

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1635

I object to the proposed changes.

The recreation area with swings is more important. There are other places to park nearby.

Off-street response – Reference number 1636

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1637

I support the proposed changes.

Charges should only apply up to 6pm

Off-street response – Reference number 1638

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1639

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1640

I object to the proposed changes.

1. The proposal will involve the loss of a small children's play area, which is more important than a few extra car parking spaces.

2. The Council should be discouraging extra car parking in Tonbridge, not encouraging it. Extra parking will simply make the local roads even more clogged up with vehicles. The Council should work with Kent CC to improve buses instead: which is precisely the opposite of what is happening at present.

Off-street response – Reference number 1641

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1642

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1644

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1645

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1646

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1648

I support the proposed changes.

Same as above

Off-street response – Reference number 1649

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1650

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1651

I object to the proposed changes.

Green pockets of green land within should be preserved; the small play area is great for young children, especially when main play area is flooded (it's unclear from diagram if this will be lost). There is ample car parking across the town, even if it means having to walk a short distance (in all the times I've parked in the town I've never failed to find a space, even if on occasions it has meant using a nearby car park).

Off-street response – Reference number 1652

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1653

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1654

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1655

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1656

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1657

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1660

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1661

I support the proposed changes.

Why not? Use this additional revenue rather than extending the charging period and you've got yourself a winner.

Off-street response – Reference number 1662

I support the proposed changes.

More spaces would be good measure.

Off-street response – Reference number 1663

I object to the proposed changes.

My daughter walks to and from school every day on her own. This is the route she takes as it's the safest route to go as she can walk all the way to school without crossing the dangerous roads by the old Fire Station and it is a heavily used route therefore safer. Taking out this route would mean it will be less safe for her. It's also an area that we use after school for leisure and waiting for after school clubs. It's also not always full in the weekdays apart from school drop off and pick up it's quite empty around 4pm onwards.

Off-street response – Reference number 1664

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1665

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1666

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1669

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1670

I support the proposed changes.

Again I don't support the local governments use of parking as a revenue stream. I do support extra parking.

I pro motorist anti government greed.

Off-street response – Reference number 1673

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1674

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1676

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1677

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1680

I object to the proposed changes.

The grassy area is well used by families and children. It would be a shame to lose this space. I also have concerns about the safety of the many children who walk this way to and from Slade primary school if the car park area is extended

Off-street response – Reference number 1681

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space adjacent to the car park is a valuable space for children to play and picnic, before and after school and at weekend particularly as it is above the flood line, unlike the nearby larger

play park and fields. Local people (including me) also use it to picnic during their lunch breaks. It is a safe walking corridor for many Slade School families as well as older children walking towards the high Street. There are always spaces in the lower castle fields car park - an extension to Upper fields is unnecessary.

Off-street response – Reference number 1682

I support the proposed changes.

More spaces makes sense to fulfil demand

Off-street response – Reference number 1683

I object to the proposed changes.

The green area in question is regularly used by families waiting to drop off or pick up children from Slade school. There is plenty of parking a few hundred meters away between the swimming pool and rugby club. Changing the green space to parking will be a danger to families dropping off or picking up from school.

Off-street response – Reference number 1684

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1685

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1686

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1687

I object to the proposed changes.

There is enough parking elsewhere in Tonbridge, this is a lovely green space which does NOT need ruining with yet more concrete! I feel this is not in the public interest at all, more like the greedy council trying to make yet more money!

Off-street response – Reference number 1690

(no comment supplied)

Plenty of parking already in lower castle field. Too near to Slade School, retirement housing and play swings for additional pollution exposure. Too near to historic monument of Tonbridge Castle, where what green space around it should be preserved. Loss of green space which is currently well used by local community and school community every school day at the end of the day.

Off-street response – Reference number 1691

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1692

I object to the proposed changes.

Too close to play swings, Slade School and retirement housing for pollution. Area of limited green space around historic monument Tonbridge Castle should be protected at all cost. Green space is used every day at Slade School pick-up by large numbers of families for playing, socialising and has been for more than 25 years. If planning discussion was not already in place there would be a good argument to campaign for village green status.

Off-street response – Reference number 1694

I object to the proposed changes.

This area near a historic monument such as Tonbridge Castle should be protected at all costs for future generations. It is too close to Slade School, play swings and retirement housing for increased pollution and dangers of increased traffic. The green space is used every day by families of Slade School for play, socialising and other post school functions. Plenty of parking lower Castle fields parking. Forcing more paid bays here will increase likelihood of parking in Slade residents bays on weekends.

Off-street response – Reference number 1697

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1699

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1700

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1701

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1703

I object to the proposed changes.

The town has enough brown sites to provide a car park. We need more biodiversity and green spaces within the town. It's its most treasured attraction.

Off-street response – Reference number 1704

I object to the proposed changes.

This is totally unacceptable taking away more green space when Tonbridge has little spaces like this left with the all the house building this area is precious near town near houses school gives nature a place trees plants insects birds etc I walk here regularly people sit here in summer take their kids to the swings play ball etc the fumes and extra population from more cars will be detrimental to local primary school elderly flats and people that live near by Tonbridge has always been severely congested we don't need more green space used to bring more pollution to a town that has high levels already. Encourage people to walk get a bus etc we need this green area it's a healing space

Off-street response – Reference number 1705

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is close to Tonbridge Castle, which is a conservation area. It is close to a school and a retirement block and residential area: therefore noise and pollution will affect the children and residents. There is already noise and drunken behaviour in the evenings and weekends. Therefore an increase in cars and public will bring more disturbance to the local residents.

Off-street response – Reference number 1707

I object to the proposed changes.

against the loss of a precious green space that benefits school children and the local community and provides space and fresh air

against extra air pollution, noise pollution and visual pollution in this area

against increased congestion in the area at times of shows and events which impacts on the locals. It is already congested enough

Off-street response – Reference number 1713

I object to the proposed changes.

further destruction of environment

Off-street response – Reference number 1714

I support the proposed changes.

Good location and more parking needed.

Off-street response – Reference number 1715

I object to the proposed changes.

There is plenty of parking already in the town. The car parks near Waitrose are often empty and it is a two minute walk to the Castle. Put up some signs showing the short walk and let people walk. Just think how good it would be for them, and how healthy.

Off-street response – Reference number 1718

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1720

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1724

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1726

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1730

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1731

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1732

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1733

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1734

I object to the proposed changes.

This is taking away more green area.

Off-street response – Reference number 1736

(no comment supplied)

This does not have an impact on Thornhills Medical Practice

Off-street response – Reference number 1737

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1738

I support the proposed changes.

More parking spaces at this location are very desirable.

Off-street response – Reference number 1739

I support the proposed changes.

Assuming this patch of green is not used for any other community activities (e.g do the kids use it to play in?) then it seems a fairly sensible new use of space on balance.

Could this new hard-standing area be designed to support alternative uses - such as seasonal markets, or pop-up events - e.g. power hookups and water supply/waste?

Off-street response – Reference number 1740

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1741

I object to the proposed changes.

There is very little benefit for this change to take place, especially when there is a large car park just around the corner and several already in the town. The green area is far more appealing and better for the environment than creating a few extra car parking spaces.

Off-street response – Reference number 1743

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1744

I support the proposed changes.

More disabled bays

Off-street response – Reference number 1745

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1747

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1748

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1749

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1750

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1751

I object to the proposed changes.

The number of flats/homes without gardens are increasing in the immediate area and it is essential that the green space close to these homes is not lost. The playing fields are often flooded or very busy with sporting events and increasingly private events like October fest. This space is also well used by children before and after school. What will happen to the footpath? Will it be re-provided? How will you make sure that there is still a safe route for children to get to school (Annison Street has already become more dangerous with the opening of Annison Street and the diversions during the waterworks). I understand the need to generate more income from the castle and its lovely to see it being used but it does cause inconvenience and disturbance to local residents. We don't need the extra noise from a larger carpark, more traffic, more anti-social behavior, worsening air-quality, less green space for our children to enjoy. Paving over green space for car parking seems to be the very opposite of what the council should be encouraging. There are lots of other car parks in Tonbridge, are they over capacity when these events take place? One of the carparks near Sainsburys seems to have become a private car park for a business. I think you should put up the price of parking in this car park and charge into the evening to encourage people to park in less popular carparks in Tonbridge and to generate more income from people attending events at the castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 1753

I support the proposed changes.

Only if done sympathetically - it is very close to the castle so any extension must be well away from the castle

Off-street response – Reference number 1754

I object to the proposed changes.

I absolutely object to this proposal, which has generated fury within the Slade and among Slade school parents. The green space between the school and the castle is cherished, vital to families as an extended place to play after school and one of only a few remaining green spaces in the town besides the sports ground. Please, make no mistake: it is this area that our children seek to play in before returning home despite the proximity of the general park and rugby field. The provision for more cars in this area is a danger to school pupils, who are accompanied by far younger children on the walk to and from school. The car park already provides a danger to manage with young children intent on playing chase and playing ball games, Having wide uninterrupted green space allows us parents a protection and clear demarked areas to manage the walk from the school to the swings. The walk also offers a loved view of the school with the variety of trees a treat to observe through the seasons. The increased interest in occasional and seasonal events in the castle is not justification to permanently alter an area which is a salvation to hundreds and hundreds of families 365 days of the year. The town is almost unrivalled for train access, there are numerous parking options within the town and supermarket car. Whatever money is costed for this proposed extension should be diverted towards measures to lessen or eliminate flooding of the lower castle fields car park. Finally I would add that faith in this council's ability to run services in Tonbridge and Malling is incredibly low (based on election results and anecdotal chatter) and the recent gains by the Green Party has been founded on support for the action they have taken to protect the town's spaces. This proposal will only serve their cause more and I advise councillors to see the political merit in cancelling this proposal if they wish to not cede more power to rival parties.

Off-street response – Reference number 1755

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1756

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1757

I object to the proposed changes.

There is enough parking in Tonbridge already, please do not tarmac over more of our green space.

Off-street response – Reference number 1758

I object to the proposed changes.

There are plenty of car parks in Tonbridge. There is no need to pave over the green spaces. We are losing more & more green space to development etc.

Off-street response – Reference number 1759

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1761

I object to the proposed changes.

I do not want green spaces to be paved over

Off-street response – Reference number 1764

I object to the proposed changes.

This green space is used for children to play on whilst waiting for a go on the swings. Also parents collecting children from Slade use this space. If the car park is extended it will also detract from the setting of the castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 1766

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1767

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1768

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1769

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1770

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1772

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1773

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1774

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1775

I object to the proposed changes.

As above.

Off-street response – Reference number 1776

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1777

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1778

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1779

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1781

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1782

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1783

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1786

I object to the proposed changes.

Concreting over yet more small precious green-space areas that are much needed and used by children - particularly Slade school children - is a VERY POOR idea. Local residents, school parents and children place high value on this green space, plus the additional pollution this will bring to these people - including the children playing in their playgrounds during leisure times - is unjustifiable. We need to INCREASE our GREEN SPACES in order to protect and increase BIODIVERSITY and ABSORB the catastrophic levels of CARBON DIOXIDE in our environments. You appear to be suggesting more short-term-gain money-making schemes. This is so very short sighted and I whole-heartedly oppose the plan.

Off-street response – Reference number 1787

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1788

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1791

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1794

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1795

I object to the proposed changes.

We are losing too many green spaces, regularly use the small play area, don't want to live in a concrete jungle

Off-street response – Reference number 1796

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1798

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1801

I object to the proposed changes.

Would not want green space to be replaced with car park

Off-street response – Reference number 1803

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1805

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1806

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1807

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1809

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1811

I object to the proposed changes.

Better public transportation on match days would solve most of these challenges. Roads around this area are tiny and already congested with traffic. Why invite more cars to park there?

Off-street response – Reference number 1814

I object to the proposed changes.

Same as my previous answers

Off-street response – Reference number 1815

I object to the proposed changes.

The addition of 28 additional places will have minimal impact for the large castle events highlighted and doesn't warrant the loss of green space.

Off-street response – Reference number 1816

I object to the proposed changes.

The castle gatehouse is already surrounded by car parks and whilst I approve changing to a pay and display car park as it is already covered in concrete I completely oppose digging up more green space for 28 car parking spaces which will spoil the attractiveness of the castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 1820

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1822

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1823

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1824

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1827

I object to the proposed changes.

There is plenty of parking available elsewhere in Tonbridge. Reducing green space to add more is unnecessary.

Area proposed is also close to a school and OAP residential homes, so impact to air quality caused by increased vehicle activity is also a concern.

Off-street response – Reference number 1828

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1832

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1833

I object to the proposed changes.

I am reluctant to see this area tarmacked over due to the impact on the natural world both plant and animal.

There are other car parks a short walk away.

Off-street response – Reference number 1834

I object to the proposed changes.

Leave us how we are. The town is becoming too big beyond its means and its affecting residents more and more

Off-street response – Reference number 1835

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1836

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space is more valuable to the town particularly when entering into the castle area it looks nicer and can be used for picnics. More trees and picnic benches.

Off-street response – Reference number 1837

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1838

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1840

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1842

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1844

I object to the proposed changes.

The swings and green areas are frequented by children and families of all ages. hundreds of studies offer scientific evidence that highlights the importance of having green spaces in urban areas for physical as well as mental health benefits in people of all ages. For children and families offers a space to socialise, picking, play etc and is a popular and well loved area to meet before and after school and during weekends or when there are special events. Most definitely objecting to this beautiful green are to be made into car park for income production!!'

Off-street response – Reference number 1845

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1848

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1850

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1852

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1854

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1856

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1857

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1859

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1860

I object to the proposed changes.

I live very close to this car park and object to the planned extension as the path and adjoining grass are an important area for the children walking up and down to Slade school and I'm concerned that increased parking will be detrimental to the look of the area and there will be an increase in traffic into the Slade area. With events at the castle the event organisers need to signpost people to the existing larger car parks behind and adjacent to Sainsburys which often has many empty spaces. Don't ruin a lovely historical area just to pollute it with increased traffic and vehicles in an already busy area.

Off-street response – Reference number 1863

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1864

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1865

I support the proposed changes.

We use the one closest to the swimming pool as we have to go to swimming classes. Oftentimes, it's difficult to find parking space due to football, boat, running people using there. There should be more spaces for swimming pool users and refund system at the castle parking space too. Otherwise, it's like a penalty for using the swimming pool.

Off-street response – Reference number 1866

I object to the proposed changes.

I do not believe the council should be paving and green spaces in the middle of the town. The site is immediately opposite a primary school and provides a safe area for all of the children to gather and play before and after school meaning they are not flooding on to the busy roads. The swings there

might as well be removed if the safe space around them is gone. They will not be safe for young children to use in the free and relaxed way they are currently. Also there appears to be no safe path to walk from the castle down to the school which is the way a huge percentage of parents and children approach in the morning. I firmly believe increased parking there will only encourage more people to drive into central tonbridge rather than walking; with the pressing concerns about carbon emissions this seems like a poor plan.

Off-street response – Reference number 1869

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1870

I support the proposed changes.

Given the location so close to the Castle, it is vital that a proper archaeological survey be undertaken of the area of the proposed new spaces before anything is changed.

Off-street response – Reference number 1872

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1873

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1874

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1875

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1878

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1880

I object to the proposed changes.

Is this really needed? Aside from events at the castle, this car park is rarely full. This would increase traffic and air pollution around the Slade, around a primary school. The loss of the green space would result in pedestrian traffic to and from the school being concentrated into a smaller area. This green space is enjoyed by the primary school children before and after school and would be lost. Not worth the change for the minimal gain; any gain would be felt only by those driving into town for events rather than the locals who use the green space on a daily basis. I strongly object to these plans when other parking is available nearby (swimming pool and memorial garden). What is happening with the former poundland car park which is closed and left empty with no building work taking place - perhaps reopen that one?

Off-street response – Reference number 1882

I object to the proposed changes.

I am incensed by this proposal! It is nothing but a callous and insensitive attempt to monetise a green space and children's play area. The council should be ashamed of itself. The car park is called UPPER CASTLE FIELD for a reason and I don't think you've given that one tiny thought!

The children's swings and upper castle field path is used by hundreds of families on a daily basis as a SAFE means of walking their children to Slade Primary School, avoiding the actual car park itself and the narrow path that is only on one side of the road: around a blind bend leading from Bank Street to The Slade.

Many of the children who attend Slade Primary School live in flats and apartments. This is the closest green space on the way to and from school, where they can have a moment to let off steam and help calm themselves, ready for a good day of learning. Consideration should also be given to the impact on local residents in the developments on the area of the old Tonbridge Market, The Slade and the retirement homes adjacent to the Upper Castle Field.

There is a large body of existing scientific evidence that highlights the physical and mental health benefits of having green spaces in urbanised areas. TMBC should be shining a light on its green areas and promoting its access... lack of access to green spaces is a future health risk to our community.

Already-stretched GPs are giving out "nature prescriptions." I cite pages 258-261 of "This Book Could Save Your Life: The Science of Living Longer Better" by scientist Graham Lawton. "Recent research also suggests that city dwellers living near green spaces are at lower risk of type 2 diabetes than those without access" (Muller, G., Harhoff, R., Rahe, C et al. 2018 'Inner-city Green Space and its Association with Body Mass Index and Prevalent Type 2 Diabetes' British Medical Journal.)
<https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/8/1/e019062>

Tonbridge Castle is one of our biggest tourist attractions. Additional parking will blight the aspect to the castle from its motte and gatehouse side. If people want to attend events at Tonbridge Castle, maybe a "park and ride" solution can be investigated? Alternatively, hold the events in the bigger, Racecourse Ground.

HRH the King and our current government have recently attended COP28, where climate change, phasing out fossil fuels and "cleaner" motoring are all on the agenda; it doesn't seem that TMBC's thinking is in step with policy. However, as more and more property is being developed in the town, maybe a longer-term vision could be to buy the existing unused car park in the centre of town behind where the old "Poundland" used to be... create more central High Street spaces and charge a premium for their use.

Off-street response – Reference number 1884

I object to the proposed changes.

Too much parking in the town as it is, and a lot of it around Sainsburys and Waitrose area are underused and unsightly. Don't provide more which will simply add to congestion and prevent people from walking a bit, getting needed exercise. If the car park is too popular increase charges and increase revenue that way, and others will choose cheaper parking a short walk away.

Off-street response – Reference number 1887

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to losing further valuable green space in the heart of town to an expanse of tarmac. Since there has been increased housing development in the Slade area in recent years, it feels even more important to maintain green 'breathing spaces' within our town. There are plenty of spaces a short walk away alongside the swimming pool and rugby club. Maybe the price of the current spaces at Upper Castle could be increased in comparison to the other car parks - so shift demand.

Off-street response – Reference number 1888

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1889

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1894

I object to the proposed changes.

We should keep our green spaces.

The swings will be removed which are used a lot by children and families.

The parking will encroach on the general feel of the area, in particular denigrating the area that forms part of the moat around the castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 1896

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1899

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1901

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1902

I object to the proposed changes.

Tidy up existing spaces. There is no need for additional parking as plenty pay and display about the town

Off-street response – Reference number 1904

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1905

I object to the proposed changes.

There are ample spaces very close by. Perhaps better signage would replace the need to remove further green space for these car parking spaces.

Off-street response – Reference number 1906

I support the proposed changes.

Increasing space for parking is sensible and reflects the real world where people use cars for transport.

Off-street response – Reference number 1910

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1911

I object to the proposed changes.

The path alongside the existing car park is used by parents and children of the Slade Primary School. Extending the car park will increase the risk to pedestrians accessing the pathway. The existing swings in the green area and the green area itself are used all the time. Removing the green area will be anaesthetic and damaging to nature.

Off-street response – Reference number 1913

I object to the proposed changes.

Where is this extra space to build additional parking. Leave well alone.

Off-street response – Reference number 1915

I object to the proposed changes.

The concreting over of more green space in the centre of town so close to the flood plane would only contribute to the already difficult flood issue in the area. Green space has been proved to be essential for mental health and this should not be sacrificed for the sake of cars - I suggest more reliable busses would enable folk to travel - busses are useless unless they are reliable. The suggestion is that this is simply to gain more revenue....at what price for our mental and ecological health? The council will find themselves spending even more on flood defences or drainage.

Off-street response – Reference number 1918

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1920

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1922

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1926

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1929

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1931

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1932

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1934

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1937

I object to the proposed changes.

I do not object to the car park extension but I do object to the spaces being pay and display

Off-street response – Reference number 1940

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1941

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1943

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1950

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1951

(no comment supplied)

Would be wrong for me to comment as I do not use this car par regularly enough

Off-street response – Reference number 1953

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1954

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1955

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1959

(no comment supplied)

Same as above

Off-street response – Reference number 1964

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1965

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1967

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1969

I support the proposed changes.

As long as they don't take away land where nature and animals live. Enough land has been taken away from Badgers, foxes and wildlife in and around the area.

Off-street response – Reference number 1970

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1973

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1974

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1983

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1984

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1989

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1991

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1992

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1993

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1997

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 1998

I object to the proposed changes.

There is enough parking already and since the increase in parking charges this car park, once constantly full, has many free spaces regardless of time or day.

Off-street response – Reference number 2001

(no comment supplied)

I strongly object . The drawing shows the new spaces on and over the public footpath that runs alongside the current carpark. This footpath is used by a huge number of mothers bringing children to and from slade primary school. Especially between the hours of 8:30 and 9:30 and then between 2:45 and 4:30 when many of the mothers collect their children and then make use of the swings and the grass area for the children to play after school . Adding extra parking spaces will make the area unsafe, dangerous and virtually unusable by mothers with small children . Especially if it means the children have to make their way between parked cars or if cars are crossing over the public footpath to park . This is not a good idea.

Off-street response – Reference number 2002

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2004

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2005

I support the proposed changes.

As long as the play area is preserved and it is completely safe to have vehicles so close to the play area

Off-street response – Reference number 2007

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2008

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2009

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2013

I support the proposed changes.

However please don't make the parking spaces too 'tight'.

Off-street response – Reference number 2014

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2015

I object to the proposed changes.

Loss of green space, safety of children walking to school, clogging up roads with more traffic.

Off-street response – Reference number 2016

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2017

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2018

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2019

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2021

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2022

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2028

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2029

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2030

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2031

I object to the proposed changes.

This will be taking away green space, children leaving school at slade walk this route so emissions from vehicles parking so near to the school will have a detrimental affect on those going to school as well as those living in the nearby area this is a badly thought idea and not one that I would support at all

Off-street response – Reference number 2032

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2033

I support the proposed changes.

Can planners look at how large modern cars are now, please? Cars are much wider these days and trying to squeeze in between them can be a task in itself. It is always useful to have more parking in the area.

Off-street response – Reference number 2035

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2036

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2040

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2041

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2044

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2050

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2051

I support the proposed changes.

as above eg. if useful to local residents and does not provoke strong objections.

Off-street response – Reference number 2052

I object to the proposed changes.

There is plenty of parking elsewhere in Tonbridge and it just means people have to walk a bit further. I have never not been able to find a parking space in one of the many pay and display car parks whether that be Waitrose, Sainsbury's or the large one on Sovereign Way. People need to stop being so lazy and park further away. The green space there is nice and with climate change and increased flooding we should not be tarmac over more grass. The number of extra spaces it would create will make a minimum impact and it will still always be full when there is an event on.

Off-street response – Reference number 2053

I object to the proposed changes.

Taking the green space from this area would destroy the amenity that people come to see and use around the castle. It would be better long term solution to extend the race course car park by swapping race course ground with Skinners Company and moving the Rugby Club.

Off-street response – Reference number 2056

I object to the proposed changes.

I feel the position in which you are going to extend the car park looks like it would have a negative impact on the flats that are situated in that area.

Off-street response – Reference number 2057

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2058

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2059

I object to the proposed changes.

There is plenty of additional parking at locations nearby

Off-street response – Reference number 2064

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2066

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2068

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2071

I object to the proposed changes.

There is plenty of car parking in tonbridge for the community. It is only a small area around the castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 2072

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2073

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2074

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2076

I object to the proposed changes.

The proposed area is currently a green space with swings for children. It is used by families on a regular basis. It will impact the Slade school children who use the area after school and overlook the residential flats. It is effectively in the castle ground and should remain green open and for people's recreational use.

Off-street response – Reference number 2077

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2078

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2079

I object to the proposed changes.

Again spaces too small improve current spaces and increase charges, cars are getting bigger and spaces have not changed since the 60's.

Off-street response – Reference number 2084

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2085

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2088

I object to the proposed changes.

I am against the removal of the swings near the castle grounds as they are a massive asset to the town for small children and avoids an over stimulating playground past the pool.

Off-street response – Reference number 2089

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2093

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2094

I support the proposed changes.

This end of town needs more parking

Off-street response – Reference number 2095

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2096

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2099

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2100

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2106

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2107

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2108

I object to the proposed changes.

taking away yet more green space for tarmac. if Tonbridge need more spaces add mutistorys to the exsisting car parks

Off-street response – Reference number 2109

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2113

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2114

I object to the proposed changes.

Permeable surfaces are extremely important to the health of our ecosystem. We need all the green space we can get! Please DO NOT PAVE OVER this green space; consider instead planting even more trees and zero-maintenance hearty plants in that area and reducing the amount of lawn grass that has to be cared for. Increasing areas for cars and reducing room for natural materials and human play is the WRONG direction.

Off-street response – Reference number 2115

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2116

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2117

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2121

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2123

I object to the proposed changes.

In the middle of a climate crisis the council should be focusing on increasing biodiversity, not increasing air pollution and encouraging car use in what is already a very busy residential area.

Off-street response – Reference number 2124

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2130

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2131

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2132

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2134

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2137

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2143

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2151

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2152

I support the proposed changes.

Only Monday to Saturday and the layout needs to be rethought

Off-street response – Reference number 2154

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2156

I object to the proposed changes.

My children regularly play on the swings in front of the castle, which will be surrounded by the extended car park. They also play in the field that the car park is proposed to extend into, so its loss would be very much noticed.

Off-street response – Reference number 2158

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2162

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2163

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2164

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2165

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2166

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2168

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2170

I object to the proposed changes.

You will kill the trade

Off-street response – Reference number 2172

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2173

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2174

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2175

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2176

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2177

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2178

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2180

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2181

I support the proposed changes.

I would like to see more chargers for Electric vehicles, the current chargers are great but I would like more Rapid chargers 50kw +

Off-street response – Reference number 2184

I support the proposed changes.

I hope there will still be greenery around the extended car park. Also a bench for people who may need to rest enroute by foot to/fro the town.

Off-street response – Reference number 2188

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2189

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2190

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2191

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2192

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2193

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2194

I support the proposed changes.

I support this as long as you are not proposing to get rid of the play area.

Off-street response – Reference number 2196

I support the proposed changes.

More parking is needed particularly at weekends during the football season in and around Castle Field Car Parks.

Off-street response – Reference number 2197

I object to the proposed changes.

Green space should not be paved over to increase tarmacked areas for parking

Off-street response – Reference number 2202

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2203

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2204

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2205

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2206

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2207

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is regularly used by parents and their children throughout the year for picnics and games.

We overlook the car park and enjoy the view of the trees and relish the green space. We don't want to lose this when so much of the area is already under threat from the council's ideas.

People are so lazy. There are plenty of other places to park, they just need to walk!

Off-street response – Reference number 2209

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2210

I object to the proposed changes.

Every single child to and from Slade primary school use this park. Unacceptable to take this away. Use the waste of land and extend the parking area in the park past the gate on right hand side. Whilst at it double yellows required outside the Slade School and no parking at any time. It's dangerous when visitors park there for traffic coming both ways and children. And they do it every weekend.

Off-street response – Reference number 2212

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2214

I object to the proposed changes.

Do not destroy the green area next to the current parking area.

Off-street response – Reference number 2215

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2219

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2223

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2224

I object to the proposed changes.

The site proposed is too close to residential properties and will alter the character of the Castle Area as the car parking will be too dominant in an area that is currently green. As shown on your plan the footpath route from the Slade crosses the site and would result in pedestrians having to walk through the car park, which could be dangerous. The swings closer to the Castle are an important little feature for parents and children which would be too close to the parking area to be comfortable in that location. They should not be removed as they provide the only local play feature in the area and can be used on the way into or back from the town for families from the Slade or further out of town.

Off-street response – Reference number 2232

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2233

I object to the proposed changes.

Leave our few green spaces alone you greedy, arrogant Conservatives!!! Children regularly play on those swings and the poor older people who live in those houses don't need fumes wafting through their windows. Do something actually useful instead of looking for easy outs

Off-street response – Reference number 2234

I object to the proposed changes.

We do not want to lose the small play area as it is used regularly on walks around the castle and town.

Off-street response – Reference number 2235

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2237

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2238

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2239

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2241

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2242

I object to the proposed changes.

The proposed space for parking is currently used by children coming out of school for safe play and picnics. Plenty of parking is available in the town. Other carparks should be advertised for events, perhaps with this one prioritised for blue-badge holders.

Off-street response – Reference number 2244

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2245

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2246

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2247

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2248

I object to the proposed changes.

The removal of a much-loved and used play facility to accommodate a few more cars sends the wrong message about a greener future for Tonbridge

Off-street response – Reference number 2250

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2252

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2254

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2255

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2256

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2259

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2260

I support the proposed changes.

I would want to consider where the extra space to provide these is coming from. I would not want to take facilities away from the children's play area.

Off-street response – Reference number 2261

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2262

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2263

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2264

I support the proposed changes.

And increase the amount of Blue Badge holder spaces

Off-street response – Reference number 2265

I support the proposed changes.

Ideally we would not lose any more green space, however this is in an area where parking spaces are at a premium and very close to large areas of green space. Provided that no trees need to be removed this area could be useful for additional parking provided it is designed sensibly.

Off-street response – Reference number 2266

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2267

I object to the proposed changes.

Climate Emergency! No more car parking spaces especially on green grass. Build bicycle parking and keep walkways open for pedestrians.

Off-street response – Reference number 2268

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2269

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2271

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2274

I object to the proposed changes.

Reduce car use, don't support car dependency and waste land that could have a much better use

Off-street response – Reference number 2277

I object to the proposed changes.

This proposal is incompatible with making Tonbridge a better place to live and more wildlife friendly!

I object on the following grounds:

1. A car park extension would further diminish the 'natural' space & atmosphere around the castle
2. Many more people who live in Tonbridge live in flats and open grassy areas that are not playing fields are very important to well being
3. The area should be designated for pollinators and be planted accordingly with wildflower meadow seeds to make the area more interesting for residents so that they can engage with wildlife
4. Constructing a carpark extension would further increase water run off into the sewers and cause further pollution into the river & streams.

5. It would enable further traffic into the centre of town through the narrow residential street of medieval origin/increase the numbers of cars in the town centre rather than encouraging other modes of transport.

6. The cars could pose a danger to the children who use the two sets of swings. Their presence and regular use endorses the fact that this is a community amenity for play and relaxation and therefore it must not be turned into car parking spaces.

7. The car park may be the most 'successful' but it is also one of the most inconvenient; poor driving by some users increases the dangers for pedestrians (including parents with children) who use the narrow streets to walk to school or to access the swimming pool, castle grounds etc.

Off-street response – Reference number 2280

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2283

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the extension here as it will result in the loss of green space or (if built upwards) will create an eyesore in a historic part of the town.

Off-street response – Reference number 2284

I support the proposed changes.

Disabled access to the castle would hopefully be improved in the Castle Gateway area.

Off-street response – Reference number 2286

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2288

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2289

I object to the proposed changes.

I object because the green space is really important to local children, I have many happy memories growing up in the slade and using the swings and grass around the area. It is more accessible than going to the park. I often see children from slade primary school using the green space after school, and good proximity to green space is so important for children.

Off-street response – Reference number 2290

I object to the proposed changes.

I have lived in the Slade area for more than 25 years. The strip of grass that is proposed for the car park extension is used extensively as a green space used by locals and families after collecting from the school. I believe that we should prioritise valuable green space over parking facilities.

Off-street response – Reference number 2292

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2293

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2294

I object to the proposed changes.

I appreciate that this car park is successful, generates income for the council and people want to park as close as possible to the castle, however the large Lower Castle Fields carpark and its extension next to the rugby club provide ample parking and are right next-door. Besides this point, as a Council you should be encouraging more people to leave their cars at home, particularly when bringing children to school. The current catchment area for Slade School according to their own website is "... from the last two years, the furthest distance from school to gain a place under this criteria has been 1.3km." This is not an unreasonable distance for an able bodied child to walk. As a community, we must protect our green spaces which create and shape our lovely rural town. It is the slow, insidious erosion of our green spaces that will ruin our town and it's environment for us and future generations.

Off-street response – Reference number 2299

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2300

I object to the proposed changes.

The green on this area is frequently used and is one of the only patches of grass that is well lit to be able to walk dogs after the sun goes down - as a woman living alone, I rely on having a safe area to be able to do this.

Off-street response – Reference number 2301

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2302

I support the proposed changes.

Must be permeable surfacing water managed within site. Regards objectives and use - Keep it reasonable and objective. Enforcement is key.

Off-street response – Reference number 2305

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2306

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2309

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2310

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2311

I object to the proposed changes.

This is clearly the council attempting to increase the TAX burden without reason or evidence.

Off-street response – Reference number 2312

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2313

I object to the proposed changes.

This area is used by many families, especially when dropping off and picking up from school. Many a picnic are enjoyed here and the swings are in use constantly.

Off-street response – Reference number 2314

I support the proposed changes.

Provided there is still sufficient play area for the children's park which is next to the current car park.

Off-street response – Reference number 2315

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2317

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2318

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2319

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2320

I object to the proposed changes.

This will increase the level of noise to my flat due to cars and increased chance of car meets in the evening, increase light pollution and congestion for busy times where cars are queuing to get out on the corner. This will also increase the chance of more cars to park over the driveways to my flat which is already an issue when being extended.

Off-street response – Reference number 2321

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2323

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2325

I object to the proposed changes.

As a user of the Tonbridge Swimming pool it is great to be able to park to use the pool. If the parking fee is extended it will affect ALL the learn to swim classes at the Tonbridge Swimming Club. The Club is the main customer of the pool and this will have a significant impact on the club and pool users. Swimming is a life skill and life saver. Please do not extended the hours of charging.

Off-street response – Reference number 2326

I object to the proposed changes.

My observations are there is sufficient car parking in the area. I would much rather the funds were directed toward improving the cycle infrastructure rather than encouraging car use. This extension takes away valuable green space and will adversely impact the local environment. This is a beautiful area around the - please don't spoil this.

Off-street response – Reference number 2328

I support the proposed changes.

As a resident with no parking on my street, I rely on the resident parking bays nearby. I object to non-residents parking for free during certain hours. I pay for my parking permit and with no available spaces have to pay again in the car parks. With the castle events growing in regularity and popularity this is a regular occurrence. I know resident parking isn't part of this consultation but I would strongly request you revise the J zone parking duration in favour of residents.

Off-street response – Reference number 2329

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2330

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2334

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2335

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2337

I support the proposed changes.

This seems fair despite the removal of yet more green space to provide the spaces. It will allow more visitors to the town which will hopefully benefit the town centre and high street

Off-street response – Reference number 2338

I object to the proposed changes.

This scheme is dangerous. putting a car park between the children's swings and the deminished area of grass, used by the children from the the school and the Slade. The grassed area is also a much appreciated by the local residence

Off-street response – Reference number 2340

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2342

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2343

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2344

I object to the proposed changes.

Area has too much concrete as is.

Off-street response – Reference number 2345

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2346

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2347

I support the proposed changes.

Please see my previous comment

Off-street response – Reference number 2348

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2350

I support the proposed changes.

More parking should be available, period. Particularly when our public transport networks are so terrible, unreliable and expensive.

Off-street response – Reference number 2352

I support the proposed changes.

But you will have to ensure there is a safe pathway for buggies and children otherwise you'll have children walking through a carpark road to get home. The path that will be built on for the parking extension is high-traffic footfall and there is no safe alternative at the moment.

Off-street response – Reference number 2355

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2359

I support the proposed changes.

Provision of children's swings are some of the only ones in a dog friendly location in Tonbridge (must be in playgrounds excluding dogs). This should be retained.

Off-street response – Reference number 2360

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2364

I object to the proposed changes.

Children play here daily before and after school. We need more green space not less

Off-street response – Reference number 2365

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2366

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2367

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2368

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2369

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2370

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2371

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2372

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2373

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2374

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2375

I support the proposed changes.

We desperately need more parking in the town centre

Off-street response – Reference number 2376

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2377

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2378

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2379

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2380

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2381

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2382

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2383

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2384

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2385

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2386

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2387

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2388

I object to the proposed changes.

There is really no shortage of car parking space in Tonbridge and the development of green areas in the castle grounds in particular is both unnecessary and environmentally ill chosen

Off-street response – Reference number 2389

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2390

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2392

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2393

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2396

I support the proposed changes.

On the basis it remains under the same parking charges as is currently..

Off-street response – Reference number 2397

I object to the proposed changes.

Green space is precious.

Off-street response – Reference number 2398

I support the proposed changes.

The Rugby Club already has its own car park and perhaps should extend that to allow non rugby parking. That could be self funded as generally speaking they and their members would have the financial capacity to do so..

Off-street response – Reference number 2399

I support the proposed changes.

I support this but not at the expense of changing on a Sunday.

Off-street response – Reference number 2400

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2401

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2402

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2403

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2406

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2408

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2409

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2410

I support the proposed changes.

I would want reassurance that a safe footpath will be kept from the junction of The Slade/Stafford Road to the Castle grounds. The current footpath is used by hundreds of people every day, schoolchildren and local residents.

Off-street response – Reference number 2411

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2412

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2413

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2414

I object to the proposed changes.

Living locally this current car park is seldom full so no need to extend.

There is ample parking in the town, visitors can walk in a few minutes.

The green area with swings is well used by families, council should be encouraging outdoor recreation not removing it.

At a time of council cutbacks, this proposal is a waste of money - council would be better placed spending on public services rather than destroying a green area for hard car parks.

Off-street response – Reference number 2416

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to turning more of Tonbridge green space into tarmac

Off-street response – Reference number 2417

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2418

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2419

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a green space everyone can enjoy and for a few extra car park spaces would be wrong to change that balance in favour of the car.

Off-street response – Reference number 2420

I support the proposed changes.

Need more disabled bays

Off-street response – Reference number 2422

I object to the proposed changes.

Clearly the option will involve further building onto green spaces - you are consulting on a proposal without giving any details of what it would entail.

Off-street response – Reference number 2423

I object to the proposed changes.

Too close to Slade primary school. Children play daily in this grassy area.

Off-street response – Reference number 2424

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2425

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2427

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2429

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2431

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2432

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2433

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2434

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2435

I support the proposed changes.

More spaces yes and anything to prevent people parking around the school and in the resident bays of the Slade is supported.

Off-street response – Reference number 2436

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2437

I support the proposed changes.

Support the extension but please don't charge on Sundays.

Off-street response – Reference number 2439

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2441

(no comment supplied)

No comment

Off-street response – Reference number 2442

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2444

I support the proposed changes.

I support the decision only if the popular swings next to the car park are not removed

Off-street response – Reference number 2447

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2448

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2449

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2450

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2451

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2452

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2453

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2454

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2456

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2457

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2459

I support the proposed changes.

Only if supported by local environmental and resident groups

Off-street response – Reference number 2461

I object to the proposed changes.

If this car park is full then people will park elsewhere. Or better they will walk and or use bicycle. We don't need more concrete in Tonbridge. We need to preserve our green spaces. This green space is just as important as the green space inside the castle. You wouldn't consider making that a car park or flats. It's a conservation area for goodness sake. That has to mean something so go away and leave this alone.

Off-street response – Reference number 2462

I object to the proposed changes.

Don't want to lose the green area often used by locals with dogs in the evening as it is lit by the car park

Off-street response – Reference number 2463

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2464

(no comment supplied)

No comment not affected

Off-street response – Reference number 2465

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2466

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2468

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2469

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2470

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2471

I support the proposed changes.

The town has grown considerably over the years so the need for extra parking is obvious.

Off-street response – Reference number 2472

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2474

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2477

I object to the proposed changes.

Wouldn't this mean losing the children's playground?

Off-street response – Reference number 2479

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2480

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2482

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2483

I support the proposed changes.

Please extend but do not charge beyond the current cut off time.

Off-street response – Reference number 2484

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2488

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2490

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the extension of any car park in the Borough, unless the money comes directly from that raised from parking charges in that car park alone. There should be no cross-subsidisation from parking charges raised elsewhere in the Borough. Rather than increasing the number of parking spaces, you should be doing much more to improve facilities for walking and cycling, and other public transport and to reduce the number of car journeys and parking spaces needed.

Off-street response – Reference number 2491

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2494

I object to the proposed changes.

This will not be in line with the requirements of parking within the limits of a listed building and spoil the appearance of this important national heritage asset.

Off-street response – Reference number 2496

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2497

I object to the proposed changes.

Firstly, I am strongly against any reduction of our green spaces at Tonbridge. Additionally, this green space is well used despite being a non-destination space and its destruction would negatively impact our local environment. Lower castle field is huge, very rarely at capacity and a suitable second option for castle access.

Off-street response – Reference number 2498

I object to the proposed changes.

You state that the car park proposed to be extended is well used on weekdays due to its proximity to Slade Primary School. I would say that the GRASS AREA adjacent to this car park is well used on weekdays due to its proximity to Slade Primary School.

This area is used both before and after school as well as around school drop-off and pick-up times, including around the before school and afterschool club times by both primary aged children as well as by their younger siblings alongside the parents. Children play together and parents talk together. It is a community space, the loss of which would be detrimental to the life of Slade School.

The route from the castle, past the swings to the school is used multiple times daily by families travelling to and from the school. Increasing the car parking here would be a health and a safety risk to all concerned - higher risk of accidents and the impact of fumes.

It is shocking that the proposal is to remove one of our remaining local patches of green space.

Removing this grassed area would be detrimental socially and environmentally.

I am very much against this proposal.

Off-street response – Reference number 2499

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2501

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2506

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2508

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2509

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2510

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2514

I object to the proposed changes.

The small play area is well used and should remain.

Off-street response – Reference number 2516

I object to the proposed changes.

This green space should be left alone. It would encroach too closely to the swings and the retirement home already in situ. Wholly unreasonable for residents and families who currently enjoy this space as it is.

Off-street response – Reference number 2517

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2518

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2523

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2524

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2526

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space proposed for this is widely used by children and their families. It is a smaller more enclosed space than the main Tonbridge park which makes it much more appealing to those who don't like the crowds in the main park.

Off-street response – Reference number 2527

(no comment supplied)

I have no views on this as I don't use the area

Off-street response – Reference number 2528

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2529

I object to the proposed changes.

This seems an unnecessary change when there are ample available parking spaces a short distance along the road at the swimming pool. These are rarely all occupied particularly during the week. The green area provides a safe spot for children to gather after school and also come across from Tonbridge High street to Slade primary school.

Off-street response – Reference number 2531

I object to the proposed changes.

There is adequate parking nearby and there are green areas around there that should be protected.

Off-street response – Reference number 2532

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2533

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2536

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2541

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2542

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2545

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2546

I object to the proposed changes.

Not necessary

Off-street response – Reference number 2547

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2548

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2549

I support the proposed changes.

I often struggle to find a space in this car park and would appreciate more spaces.

Off-street response – Reference number 2551

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2552

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2553

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2554

I object to the proposed changes.

I totally oppose any expansion to the car park in Upper Castle Field. The extra pollution generated by the addition cars would be detrimental to the health of the children from Slade School, those using the playground facilities, and the elderly residents nearby.

The area would benefit from more tree planting, which would have a positive effect on the local environment and wildlife, along with improving air quality.

The proposed site is within a conservation area and in close proximity to Tonbridge Castle, an historical monument.

We need our green spaces within the centre of Tonbridge.

Off-street response – Reference number 2557

I object to the proposed changes.

Central Tonbridge is a historic town centre. Turning more of it into a car park will denigrate the unique environment. There is an abundance of parking in Tonbridge town centre already and concreting more of the non-car-park areas must not be permitted.

Off-street response – Reference number 2558

I object to the proposed changes.

The cost of living crisis has already made things extremely difficult for families these changes would impact many of the local team sporting activities!

Off-street response – Reference number 2559

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2560

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2561

I object to the proposed changes.

I do not feel that it is necessary to extend the parking at Upper Castle Field and remove green space that is used regularly for recreational purposes

Off-street response – Reference number 2562

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2564

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2565

I object to the proposed changes.

Another money making exercise for the local council.

Off-street response – Reference number 2566

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2570

I object to the proposed changes.

As a resident of the Slade we have already suffered enough with infrastructure problems they will only be worse with this proposal. Traffic is already horrendous especially at weekends. Removal of this green area is completely unacceptable. This is meant to be a conservation area and yet this kicks that in the teeth. Perhaps look at other areas like the possible extension of Deaconsfield car park by Juddians rugby club.

Off-street response – Reference number 2571

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2573

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2576

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2578

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2579

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2580

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2582

I support the proposed changes.

Please stop robbing people. Parking should be FREE for everyone.

Off-street response – Reference number 2583

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2584

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2585

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2587

I support the proposed changes.

If it doesn't affect miniature railway for children

Off-street response – Reference number 2588

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2593

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2594

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2596

I object to the proposed changes.

1. It would destroy the green space , currently ysed by many, especially Slade school children
2. Already too many cars in that area

Off-street response – Reference number 2597

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2598

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2599

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2602

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2609

I object to the proposed changes.

This could impact residents of Castlefields with regard to their view, noise and the general peacefulness of the area, and the grassy area will be impacted in terms of appearance of the area which is pleasant at the moment. Children use this area to reach the swings and for general recreation.

Off-street response – Reference number 2611

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2612

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2613

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2614

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2616

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2617

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2619

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2623

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2625

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2626

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2628

I object to the proposed changes.

I believe there is no need to pave over green space to make additional parking spaces at this location.

Off-street response – Reference number 2630

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2633

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2634

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2637

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2638

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2639

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2640

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2642

I object to the proposed changes.

The area proposed for more parking has high value as a green space for people in Slade School and for parents and pedestrians who are walking from the Castle and the park.

Once built on as a car park, this high amenity area will be lost to the school and the public.

Off-street response – Reference number 2643

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2646

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2647

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2648

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2653

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2655

I object to the proposed changes.

Swimming people using this car park, and it No for extended hours

Off-street response – Reference number 2656

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2657

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2659

I object to the proposed changes.

Tonbridge Castle is a significant historic building and should not have cars parked right around it. Please protect the views and vista of the castle, motte and Bailey. This green open space is used by children from the primary school after school.

Off-street response – Reference number 2667

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2671

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2680

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2683

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2689

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2690

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2692

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2693

I object to the proposed changes.

There is a balance to be struck between providing car parking and maintaining the precious views of Tonbridge Castle. For a gain of just 28 places, the detriment to the view tips too far for comparatively little. This is particularly the case when there is very large car park at Lower Castle Field a short

distance away.

Off-street response – Reference number 2695

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2697

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2699

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2704

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2707

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2708

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2711

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2714

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2715

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2716

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2719

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2725

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2726

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2727

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2729

I support the proposed changes.

There is no mention of motorcycle parking, new or existing.

Off-street response – Reference number 2731

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2732

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2733

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2734

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2735

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2738

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2740

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2742

I support the proposed changes.

Don't charge after 8 and Sundays and BH.

Off-street response – Reference number 2744

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2745

I object to the proposed changes.

My response is written from a Public Health Perspective, as I am a Public Health Practitioner. I do not support the proposal to add parking bays over a green space (including children's swings) which afford physical activity opportunities to children. As a Slade parent, I witness daily in the summer months that children utilize the upper castle green space for play, and for being physically active. The swings in the Upper castle area green space are a much-loved part of our town and in use all year round; not least when the swings in the park are inaccessible due to the park being flooded. It is not acceptable to take the view point that swings are available in the main Tonbridge Racecourse Sportsground Park. These are a much further walk for those at the south end of town, and the Racecourse Sportsground Park swings are frequently out of action due to the park being flooded and inaccessible from the swimming pool side. Obesity costs the NHS around £6.5 billion a year. Data from the National Child Measurement Programme (NCMP)/Kent Public Health Observatory for Tonbridge and Malling show that both childhood obesity levels remain high (Reference:

https://www.kpho.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/45363/Children-Tonbridge-and-Malling.pdf .

It is nonsensical to simultaneously invest cash in obesity prevention and reduction, whilst removing spaces and opportunities for childhood physical activity.

Off-street response – Reference number 2747

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2749

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2750

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2751

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2754

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2755

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2757

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2758

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2759

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2761

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2762

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2763

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2764

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2766

I object to the proposed changes.

The space is used daily by the children and parents of Slade primary school. There is a huge car park around the corner that is only full and busy on a Saturday and Sunday morning during football and rugby season. Other than that there is adequate parking 80% of the time and it would be a huge shame to lose a much used area to more parking spaces...!

Off-street response – Reference number 2768

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2769

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2770

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2771

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2773

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a disproportionate response to the issue - use of gateway parking will assist in part and events at the castle are for short periods of time and don't justify the impact on local amenities - green space used by children, families, impact on local residents. Regular user of. Car park at different times and rarely an issue.

Off-street response – Reference number 2775

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2776

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2778

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2780

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2781

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2782

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2785

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2786

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2790

I support the proposed changes.

I believe this will help protect spaces in Lower Castle Fields Car Park for the benefit of customers attending Tonbridge Swimming Pool and the Racecourse Sportsground

Off-street response – Reference number 2793

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2796

(no comment supplied)

No comment on this

Off-street response – Reference number 2799

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2801

I object to the proposed changes.

Leave our green spaces alone. Rearrangement of existing car parks around the sainsburys area would be a better idea.

Off-street response – Reference number 2802

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2803

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2804

I object to the proposed changes.

Think for the sake of 28 extra spaces it would be detrimental to the area and-

1. Greatly reduce an already small green play area for small children.
2. Distract from the historic appearance of Tonbridge Castle.

Off-street response – Reference number 2807

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2811

(no comment supplied)

Never go there, not got a clue what you are talking about!

Off-street response – Reference number 2813

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2814

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2817

I object to the proposed changes.

This car park sits within the footprint of Tonbridge Castle's inner and outer barbican walls. Tonbridge Castle is a Schedule Ancient Monument [SAM] and therefore any increase in parking provision would be detrimental to the SAM listing.

The current thinking within the heritage sector is to remove car parking provision within the close vicinity of historic assets and not increase them.

However, should permission be granted a full archeological investigation should be undertaken under the management of Historic England.

Off-street response – Reference number 2818

I object to the proposed changes.

As a local parent whose child attends Slade Primary School, I was appalled to hear that the valuable green space next to the Upper Castle Field Car Park. This is one of the few places that children can run and play and let off steam after/before school, and I feel this is imperative for their mental and physical health (and that of the parents!). Could money not be spent improving local bus services so that people can access the town without the need for parking?

Off-street response – Reference number 2819

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2820

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2821

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2822

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2826

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2827

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2828

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2834

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2835

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2836

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2840

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2842

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2844

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2846

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2847

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2848

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the extension of the existing car park because it will encourage even more people to try and park in the Slade area, instead of parking in more appropriate locations and walking the short distance across town. Access for emergency vehicles to the Slade area is seriously compromised at the busy times quoted by you.

Secondly, I object because the existing grassed area provides recreational space and is all that remains of the castle's outer bailey and, as such, is part of the historic fabric and location of the castle. I also wish to state that I objected to the creation of the existing car park on these same grounds fifty years ago.

Finally, car parking within the borough should not purely be determined by potential income generation, but by consideration of the needs and requirements of the local residents.

Off-street response – Reference number 2849

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the extension of the existing car park because it will encourage even more people to try and park in the Slade area, instead of parking in more appropriate locations and walking the short distance across town. Some incentive (lower parking charges on the other side of town) would encourage this.

Access for emergency vehicles to the Slade area is seriously compromised at the busy times you quote. It is a significant concern as a resident of the Slade area, when there is double parking outside the Slade primary school. I have been told by firefighters that they fear they would not get an appliance through to us.

Secondly, I object because the existing grassed area provides recreational space and is all that remains of the castle's outer bailey and, as such, is part of the historic fabric and location of the castle. I object to the cheerless prospect of yet more tarmac and more cars in front of our beautiful ancient castle. Why does it always have to be about money? Ask yourselves.

Off-street response – Reference number 2850

I object to the proposed changes.

Extending the car park here would destroy an area of grass well-used by children and families for playing in good weather, and ruin views towards the castle from this direction. Instead, focus should be on encouraging people to walk or use public transport - for example, do parents dropping or collecting children at Slade Primary School really need to drive? If extra spaces are really needed, there is wasteland sitting empty nearby, in the form of a car park of an abandoned and completely derelict former pub which has been closed for years - why not put that to use instead?

Off-street response – Reference number 2854

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2856

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the loss of green space in Tonbridge - the car parks by the swimming pool and rugby club should be sufficient in that area - perhaps they can be better signposted together with signposting to the town/castle from each of those carparks

Off-street response – Reference number 2859

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2861

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2862

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2865

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2867

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2871

I object to the proposed changes.

Yet again TMBC taking away green space from the public for greedy purposes. It's public space next to the castle by adding more car parking spaces it will ruin the look to the area, maybe instead of adding extra spaces get rid of the electric charging points which take up to much space! There's plenty of car parking spaces closeby in the swimming pool car parks!

Off-street response – Reference number 2872

I object to the proposed changes.

To take away a large sward of grass land is very wrong in this time, and the pollution it would bring to those living in the flats nearby, and the the children who walk that way from school

Off-street response – Reference number 2874

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2876

I object to the proposed changes.

There is absolutely no need to do this given (a) the extra bays proposed in the gateway area and (b) the significant level of spaces in the lower ground car park. The green space should be preserved as much as possible for health and aesthetic reasons.

Off-street response – Reference number 2877

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2878

I object to the proposed changes.

Green spaces should be preserved for the benefit of the environment. Additional spaces will mean more pollution near to a primary school and retirement residences. The council should be encouraging fewer cars not more and investing in increased public transport. There is plenty of parking near to the swimming pool and car users should be encouraged to use these existing facilities.

Off-street response – Reference number 2880

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2881

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2883

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2886

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2887

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2888

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2889

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2890

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2891

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2892

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2893

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2894

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2897

I object to the proposed changes.

You will kill the town as more people will start using Tunbridge wells or online shops

Off-street response – Reference number 2898

I object to the proposed changes.

There is always capacity in the car park opposite Waitrose, (on the other side of the road to Waitrose & Iceland). Council should support local transport, walking etc, not tarmac grassland. terrible idea. The back of the castle is also enhanced by the openness of the grounds.

Off-street response – Reference number 2899

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2900

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a valuable, safe walking route to Slade Primary School and the car park extension would introduce hazards and additional pollution for children and their families that use this route as part of their daily routine.

Off-street response – Reference number 2901

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2902

I object to the proposed changes.

Although often full, there are plenty of other options close enough. No need to ruin a beautiful green space to save an extra few minutes of walking. Can't think of anyone that would rather it was all covered over so they don't have to try another car park minutes away.

Off-street response – Reference number 2903

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2904

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2905

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2906

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2907

(no comment supplied)

See answer to point 11

Off-street response – Reference number 2908

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2910

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2911

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2912

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2914

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2915

I object to the proposed changes.

I value this green space and especially the children's swings, which we use regularly and which I see being used pretty much every time I pass. I often see multiple families socialising there after school and at weekends.

Off-street response – Reference number 2916

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2917

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2918

I object to the proposed changes.

We need to protect the green space and the swing and play area. If extra parking is needed, use the parking opposite the train station.

Off-street response – Reference number 2919

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2920

I object to the proposed changes.

I don't want more parking because it encourages more cars into the town, when we should be promoting use of public transport. I'm not interested in the council making more money from car parks, nor do I think it is necessary to bulldoze a children's playground - where I take my son to play.

Off-street response – Reference number 2921

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2922

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2923

I object to the proposed changes.

Don't get rid of green spaces and play areas to make more tarmac.

Off-street response – Reference number 2925

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2926

I object to the proposed changes.

I use this green space regularly with my two children, they play on the swings then run around on the grass with friends. I think if the space had additional parking this would make the play space unusable and unsafe for children. During the winter months it's the only space to take the children to because the race course play area is always flooded. There is ample parking in this area for 95% of the time, and the carpark at the back of the rugby club is very rarely used and surely this could be made better use of e.g. putting a machine there etc. The council should be promoting less car use also and adding more parking space without exploiting the existing spaces is poor planning!

Off-street response – Reference number 2927

I object to the proposed changes.

No to loss of green space and children's play area next to castle. The council should be promoting more use of public transport which is greener and kinder to the environment.

Off-street response – Reference number 2928

I object to the proposed changes.

I regularly park in this car park and there are always spaces. When there is an event at the castle people can park in the huge swimming pool car park. The green space , swings and trees should remain as there is no need to extend the car park

Off-street response – Reference number 2929

I object to the proposed changes.

There is another car park within 3 minutes walk, beside the swimming pool.

There are several other car parks within 10 minutes walk - waitrose, and behind the high Street.

The council should be encouraging walking and cycling, not additional car use. The town is already congested, incentivising additional car use is nonsensical.

Off-street response – Reference number 2930

I object to the proposed changes.

It looks like your intention is to remove and pave over a green space containing swings. I'm sure the parking would sometimes be useful, but you can always park elsewhere nearby, such as Waitrose, when necessary.

Off-street response – Reference number 2932

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2933

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2934

I object to the proposed changes.

I object to the proposal for three reasons. 1) I disagree that there is insufficient demand for parking spaces in Tonbridge when there are plenty of nearby car parks. As a Tonbridge resident for over 10 years I have never not been able to find a parking space in town when needed. 2) The proposed spaces are too close to people's homes and to where children walk and play exposing them to further air pollution 3) The council should be encouraging people out of their cars rather than encouraging more vehicles into the centre of town. With a train station so close by, and easy access by cycle paths, we shouldn't sacrifice further green space for the sake of a few parking spaces.

Off-street response – Reference number 2935

I object to the proposed changes.

With Slade school , elderly accommodation, and play equipment surrounding this car park, the air is already polluted and we should not add more filthy air for them to breathe.

This is a conservation area !! We need more trees nor more pollution.!!

Off-street response – Reference number 2936

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2937

I support the proposed changes.

Slade School causes a real problem with parents regularly parking on double yellow lines directly opposite the school gates. I think there should be a 'reward' for parents who actually use the car parks. Because the parking officers are never around at school run hour.

Off-street response – Reference number 2938

I object to the proposed changes.

Ridiculous idea.

Off-street response – Reference number 2939

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2940

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2941

I object to the proposed changes.

Using this piece of green space seems a very short sighted option, which would impact on local residents and users of local amenities, such as Slade School. It is obvious that this space contributes to the local carbon sink and is a resource for local wildlife, but it also provides a safe area for supervised child recreation. This site is a great place for children to play on their way to the Slade School and also after school with their friends. It is also important for preschool children, who can safely run around while waiting for siblings to come out of the Slade School. Not only would the proposed parking spaces reduce the green area, but it would separate the public playground from the rest of the green space, this would create a real risk, as children would have to walk across the parking spaces to get to the rest of the green space and the path to the school. Surely this is totally unacceptable.

In addition to these considerations, the increased pollution would impact the residents of the local housing and pupils at the school. Especially as this site is raised above both the housing and the school, meaning that particulates would settle and get into the buildings and the school playground, thereby contributing to asthma and other respiratory diseases.

It is questionable how much these extra parking spaces are needed, as events at the Castle are sporadic and there many additional parking spaces within a five minute walk. If additional spaces are seen to be needed, I would like to suggest that more of Tonbridge's existing car parks could be made multi-storey, as has been done in the car park at Tonbridge railway station. I think the Lower Castle Field car park would be perfect for this option.

Off-street response – Reference number 2942

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2943

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2947

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2950

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2953

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2955

I support the proposed changes.

I support this proposal, as long as there is no detriment to the landscape/environment

Off-street response – Reference number 2956

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2957

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2959

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2960

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a valuable green space with facilities for childrens swings, we need to protect out green space for today's and future generations

Off-street response – Reference number 2961

I object to the proposed changes.

The green area is used by many children and should not be turned into a car park.

Off-street response – Reference number 2962

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2963

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2965

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2966

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2967

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2968

I object to the proposed changes.

There is sufficient parking already in existence. Encourage car free access. Get your green credentials in order. Stop over developing the town centre unnecessarily.

Off-street response – Reference number 2969

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2971

I support the proposed changes.

Agree as long as it doesn't impact the green spaces around.

Off-street response – Reference number 2972

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2973

I object to the proposed changes.

I do not think converting green space to concrete is ever a good idea particularly when the existing area is used for children to get to school. It will put children's health in danger by increased emissions, it will create extra traffic and therefore create extra danger for the children, also you are already proposing 9 spaces in the Upper Castle Car Park. Perhaps there needs to be better incentives to use existing car parks which are slightly further from the High Street but still within walking distance like the ones by Sovereign Way. Also, more concrete, worse drainage for the town which is at an increased risk of flooding with weekly storms as it is becoming a norm.

Off-street response – Reference number 2975

I object to the proposed changes.

I very strongly object to this proposal. This should be safeguarded green space. It's in an area where a bigger car park would be visually detrimental, and there is plenty of parking in the car park by the little railway.

I disagree with your view that this car park is often full - I use it sometimes and have never found it near to full or full. Event users of the castle or park should not expect parking so close, most can walk from other town car parks easily.

Off-street response – Reference number 2979

I object to the proposed changes.

It is not clear whether the play equipment will be retained. Rather than encouraging the use of more cars, parking spaces should not be added. Instead people should be encouraged to walk or cycle.

Off-street response – Reference number 2980

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2983

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2985

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2986

I object to the proposed changes.

The grass area is used by families and school children all year long it is a much needed green space and well used route by children to slade primary school

Off-street response – Reference number 2987

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2988

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2989

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 2990

I support the proposed changes.

I do not support stopping the free parking on Sundays and Bank Holidays in this car park.

Off-street response – Reference number 2994

I object to the proposed changes.

It will take away green space.

Off-street response – Reference number 2998

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3000

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3001

I object to the proposed changes.

This will affect the privacy of residents in Castle Fields if my understanding is correct and therefore the value of the properties. These are elderly people. What about the playground?

Off-street response – Reference number 3002

I support the proposed changes.

There's a hive of activity in this area almost continuously.

However additional consideration should be given to reduced fee for electric cars- thus encouraging less pollutant vehicles in the centre of town.

Off-street response – Reference number 3003

I object to the proposed changes.

If the car parks don't get used for events such as markets especially on Sundays when the sports ground is used they wouldn't need extending.

Off-street response – Reference number 3004

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3005

I object to the proposed changes.

Tonbridge has a vast amount of parking if well used.

Off-street response – Reference number 3007

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3008

I object to the proposed changes.

Keep green space and swings

Off-street response – Reference number 3010

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3011

I object to the proposed changes.

Loosing the green space in that area will be a backwards step for young people after school (chatting and swings). The flats nearby are likely to get disturbed more with more motor activity.

Off-street response – Reference number 3012

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3013

I object to the proposed changes.

I believe that extending the Upper Castle Field car park on the basis suggested is going to destroy an area of green space. It will also be very close to properties in Castle Fields.

Off-street response – Reference number 3016

I support the proposed changes.

Charging for the car park will just mean that there will be more cars parking on the Roads around Larkfield and the other villages.

Off-street response – Reference number 3018

I object to the proposed changes.

The space is used for families, dog walkers and everyone walking around the area. To add more parking is taking away from the people of Tonbridge that want to enjoy the green space. We don't want to get more people using their cars to come here to enjoy this beautiful part of the town there needs to be more focus on affordable and reliable public transport.

Off-street response – Reference number 3019

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3021

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a green area with swings used by many families during the day and after school and a play to run around. Especially useful for those children and families who are deterred by the size of the large playground in the park.

Off-street response – Reference number 3023

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3024

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3028

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3029

I object to the proposed changes.

This is an important green space with swings, much used by local families and enhances the look of the front of the castle

Off-street response – Reference number 3031

I object to the proposed changes.

It is a great space for all everyone to use especially for the children after school.

Off-street response – Reference number 3032

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3033

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3034

I object to the proposed changes.

Loss of more green and recreational space in walking distance of bus routes and the train station.

Off-street response – Reference number 3035

I object to the proposed changes.

This park is used by the local people who live in the Slade, most of whom have small gardens. A local space for children to play games is necessary and it is opposite the school and well used in summer.

Off-street response – Reference number 3036

I object to the proposed changes.

The green area provides amenities for families and a safe space for between the car park and the castle. The green space also adds to the area around the castle and extending the car park would impact on the attractiveness of the area around the castle, which is a real asset to Tonbridge.

Off-street response – Reference number 3037

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3038

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3039

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3040

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3041

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3042

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3045

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3046

I support the proposed changes.

I support the need for more spaces but a footpath must stay and so must the swings

Off-street response – Reference number 3047

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3048

I object to the proposed changes.

There is another car park around the corner which almost always has space

Off-street response – Reference number 3049

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3050

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3052

I support the proposed changes.

People already park in the residential permitted area around The Slade. Although a car park is not ideal, hopefully it would alleviate pressure on residential permit areas, particularly outside of permit hours (Sundays and evenings).

Off-street response – Reference number 3053

I object to the proposed changes.

We need green space, there is plenty of parking in the town

Off-street response – Reference number 3054

I object to the proposed changes.

There is no need for this. Open spaces in Tonbridge should be preserved not destroyed.

Off-street response – Reference number 3056

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3058

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3060

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3061

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3062

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3063

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3064

I object to the proposed changes.

The area is busy enough without more car parking spaces

Off-street response – Reference number 3065

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3066

I object to the proposed changes.

Just not needed.

Off-street response – Reference number 3067

I object to the proposed changes.

We have plenty of expensive parking in the area why take a piece of green away. It's so close to the flats, adds more polluting cars to a school and residential area. People have legs and there are almost

12 council car parks to use and walk from. This green area has been part of tonbridge for generations and should be made a community space not built on.

Off-street response – Reference number 3068

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3069

I object to the proposed changes.

There are many car parks nearby. We should not be building more parking space unless for car clubs

Off-street response – Reference number 3070

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3071

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3072

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3073

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3076

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3077

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3078

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3079

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3080

I object to the proposed changes.

The Castle will already have added some spaces in the grounds from the Gateway. To extend this car park would take away the grass area, make an eyesore view from the castle, increase traffic and therefore danger to Slade pupils as well. There is choice of parking including swimming pool car park and I don't feel more is needed.

You encourage people to not use their cars so no more spaces needed for the sake of our green areas

Off-street response – Reference number 3081

I object to the proposed changes.

Environment and pollution impact

Off-street response – Reference number 3082

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3083

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3084

I object to the proposed changes.

Just because this car park is "successful" does not mean it should be extended. One part of the statement does not flow to the other, or at least it implies parking should be extended to every part of the town where people want to park (which they do anyway, illegally, on the High Street!). But the town already has vast amounts of parking, notably around Sainsbury's/Avenue du Puy, within a 5-10 minute walk. Most towns direct people to park where they *should* park rather than building over green and historic spaces because of convenience.

I object to this proposal because a) people should be parking on the existing car parks and better signage and strategy would allow them to understand they can easily walk across; b) because this is both a site of historic significance to the town and a green space

Off-street response – Reference number 3085

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3086

I object to the proposed changes.

It's a place for the young of Tonbridge to walk on their way to school. Taking it away is abhorrent.

Off-street response – Reference number 3087

I object to the proposed changes.

It's a lush green area that is already surrounded by concrete. We need to hold on to these pockets of open spaces so that we can protect the environment and air quality. Not every patch of grass has to be built on! The local school and houses still need to enjoy their surroundings. Children play on this patch of grass and swings.

Off-street response – Reference number 3089

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3091

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3092

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3093

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3094

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3097

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3098

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3101

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3102

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3105

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3107

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3108

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3109

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3110

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3111

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3112

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3113

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3114

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3115

I object to the proposed changes.

This is a valuable play area

Off-street response – Reference number 3119

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3122

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3125

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3126

I object to the proposed changes.

Should we not be encouraging more public transport and less cars rather than concreting over green spaces?

Off-street response – Reference number 3128

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3134

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3135

I object to the proposed changes.

Building car parking spaces on an important carbon sink right next to housing for the elderly and a primary school makes no sense. We should be discouraging traffic here, not removing the green spaces that are beautiful, used and useful.

Off-street response – Reference number 3136

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3137

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3138

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3139

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3141

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3142

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3143

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3146

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3149

I object to the proposed changes.

It is vital that we keep green spaces in the town of Tonbridge. This area already has sufficient parking in and around the castle and bays on the High Street. The retirement flats, thriving primary school, play area are used by our most vulnerable members of the population when considering increased pollution - retired older adults living adjacent to the castle and children up to the age of 11 +. It's used by mothers as a safe space , frames the castle , enables pupils from the school to walk safely alongside the existing carpark.

Off-street response – Reference number 3151

I object to the proposed changes.

The green space is more necessary than more parking.

Off-street response – Reference number 3153

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3155

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3156

I support the proposed changes.

Yes it will benefit the area an business.

Off-street response – Reference number 3157

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3159

I support the proposed changes.

As previous comments, first hour should be free. People dropping and picking up from school should always be given a period of free parking. Charge from 2 to 4 hours and sensibly priced season tickets should be available for longer periods. Employ more parking wardens (council not "contract"). These will more than pay for themselves in my opinion

Off-street response – Reference number 3163

I object to the proposed changes.

This is an area by a primary school and older people housing so air quality must be protected. Also the entrance to the town's greatest asset, the castle, should be protected and kept green and attractive.

Off-street response – Reference number 3164

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3165

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3168

I object to the proposed changes.

There is sufficient capacity at other car parks in Tonbridge town centre so extending the car park here is unnecessary. The Green space which would be lost is a carbon sink and destroying it is contrary to the Council's own carbon targets. The extension is likely to increase the number of vehicles in the area which is adjacent to a primary school and elderly peoples accommodation and the resultant worsening air quality will disproportionately affect very young and old people according to scientific research.

Off-street response – Reference number 3169

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3171

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3172

I object to the proposed changes.

This is LOSS of OPEN green SPACE , the public use this area to enjoy the freedom of movement and picnics etc. 2nd will bring MORE parked CARS next to a Historic building/castle and may over power

the look and appearance of an historic property.

Off-street response – Reference number 3179

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3180

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3181

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3184

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3193

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3196

I object to the proposed changes.

This is making people poorer , it is a stealth charge , those who park illegally should be punished through fines , people want to go to work and live not pay fees to live , council tax is already at an extortionate rate , nobody asked or wants parking charges .

Off-street response – Reference number 3198

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3199

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3200

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3202

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3203

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3204

I object to the proposed changes.

More hard standing means more runoff so exacerbating flooding pressure.

The parking is rarely completely full.

We should be encouraging other forms of transport, not more cars.

The addition of the Castle Gateway spaces is more than adequate, negating the need for this extension. Other than this there is already more than enough parking in Tonbridge; if you need to park a little further away the distances to walk are small and such minor exercise should not be discouraged.

Off-street response – Reference number 3205

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3207

I support the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)

Off-street response – Reference number 3221

I object to the proposed changes.

extending the car parking at Upper Castle Field would mean losing the green space and the children's play area. I believe it would impact negatively on the residents of the elderly persons accommodation immediately behind the carpark. This would bring noise nuisance and exhaust pollution which is unacceptable not to mention detrimental to health.

Off-street response – Reference number 3228

I object to the proposed changes.

Comments supplied but due to size constraints cannot be entered - see individual supplied responses

Off-street response – Reference number 3230

I object to the proposed changes.

(no comment supplied)