

CPRE

Comment Ref: DLPS7269

Nigel Britten: CPRE Kent (Sevenoaks District Committee)

"Fawkham/Hartley, MX52/MX 53 We object to these proposals for these reasons: 1. The sites are in the Green Belt. While we recognise the legitimacy of reviewing the Green Belt boundary as part of Local Plan preparation, we do not consider the change justifiable in this case because the Green Belt locally is mostly 'strongly performing' and because development would cause settlements to coalesce. 2. The facilities and infrastructure proposed derive from, and support, only the new development rather than meeting the District's wider needs, while at the same time threatening the use of existing facilities. The new schools, replacing existing schools, are not considered necessary. A sports facility would draw use from existing facilities with underused capacity. 3. The proposals fail to support the Sevenoaks Vision 2015-2035, which says: 'The District is made up of [a] patchwork of distinct communities with strong local character and we will protect this local identity for existing and future generations.' The amount of housing proposed at Fawkham, a hamlet of fewer than 200 houses, is far out of proportion to the existing small settlement and would transform it, fundamentally changing its character and the local identity. In fact, no need for housing at Fawkham has been identified. 4. Local roads are not adequate to cope with the amount of traffic generated by this scale of development."

THAMES WATER

Comment Ref: DLPS6804

Richard Hill: Thames Water

"Water Response Not our water area Waste Response The scale of development/s is likely to require upgrades to the wastewater network. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. The plan should determine the magnitude of spare capacity currently available within the network and what phasing may be required to ensure development does not outpace delivery of essential network upgrades to accommodate future development/s. Failure to liaise with Thames Water will increase the risk of planning conditions being sought at the application stage to control the phasing of development in order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development. The developer can request information on network infrastructure by visiting the Thames Water website <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-largesite/Planning-your-development>. Additional comments Waste: Thames Water supports the approach to Sustainable Drainage as set out in the e Planning Practice Guidance. SuDS provide opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding, remove pollutants and provide amenity, recreation and wildlife benefit. In particular developers should ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to source as possible and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground or watercourse. It is only when all options have been exhausted and there is not practical reason for using sustainable drainage, that developers should seek connection to the public network."

DARTFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Comment Ref: DLPS7225

Mark Aplin: Dartford Borough Council

"3. Hartley/Fawkham Corinthians Sports Club (MX52) and land between Parkfield and Fawkham Road, Fawkham/Hartley (MX53) – The proposals could result in around 800 dwellings being developed adjoining Hartley and Fawkham, which lie immediately adjacent to the settlement of Longfield within Dartford Borough. There is a serious concern that the proposals could lead in time to a coalescence of separate villages, including Longfield (in Dartford), Hartley, New Ash Green and Fawkham, significantly undermining the integrity of the Green Belt. A very significant continuous built-up area would be created across a large swathe of what is currently Green Belt punctuated by villages. This is due to the proximity of these settlements to each other. Nonetheless, they currently have discrete identities and a rural feel. The proposals would likely result in indefensible Green Belt boundaries leading to a suburbanisation of the area and significant urban sprawl. The addition of 800 new homes to the existing settlements is unlikely to enable the provision of sufficient services and infrastructure to match the

requirements of the size of settlement arising from the agglomeration of currently separate villages. The current form of development in these villages, each with its own lower order centre, would with coalescence, result in an extended low density built up area of a geographic size exceeding the largest urban settlements within Sevenoaks and Dartford but without the sustainability benefits and higher order facilities that a compact form of development of this extent would normally provide. As a result of the lower order service provision and the low density of the settlement, travel is likely to be predominantly car-based. This is notwithstanding the presence of Longfield Station, which is only walkable from the northern end of the potential extended settlement. The existing network of narrow country roads required to access higher order facilities and the strategic road network is unsuited to additional significant demand from new development. Potential new development would also give rise to parking pressures in and around Longfield Station. Without additional provision adjacent to the station, which cannot easily be accommodated on the Dartford side where the main station entrance is, the parking demand will impact on residential roads within the vicinity of the station. These pressures are already apparent in residential streets in Longfield, close to the station but will extend yet further with additional development. Longfield is a rural service centre which has a district shopping centre, railway station, GP surgery, secondary school and primary school, serving surrounding settlements including Hartley. The scale of additional development proposed could have a significant impact on Longfield's local road network, rail service capacity, GP surgery and schools in particular. We note that Hartley does not currently have a GP surgery or secondary school and would rely on rail services from Longfield station. We note from Appendix 1 that the development of this site will only be permitted where it is linked to the timely provision of evidenced infrastructure and supported by a transport assessment. We would need to see the results of this work to understand the potential impacts of the proposals on Longfield. In terms of local impacts, it is noted that consultant work commissioned by Sevenoaks has identified a landscape impact at the higher end ("moderate") versus other sites. "

Comment Ref: DLPS6444

Cllr Steve Brown: Dartford Borough Council

"I am emailing in response to your ' call for sites ' in the Sevenoaks Borough Council area in so far as they relate to the sites at Corinthian and Downs Valley/Parkfield/Bankside in Hartley. I have several concerns for the impact these proposals would have on the immediate area and indeed neighbouring Parishes and areas. As you may or may not be aware, Longfield is a very busy commuter village that forms part of the Dartford Borough. The Parishes of Hartley, Fawkham and Longfield are intrinsically intertwined and I hope and urge that consideration be given to the impact on the neighbouring area of Longfield. I am concerned that the traffic generation (on already busy roads), pressure on school places and impact on the number of commuters would have an irreversible 'character changing' effect on the whole area. The sites are discussed are in the main Green Belt and 'very special' or exceptional circumstances need to demonstrated to overturn the very powerful protections that exist on Green Belt Land. I have formed the opinion that NO such circumstances arise here and as such I would strongly recommend that these sites are rejected from the assessment and other sites throughout your Borough be considered that will be more suitable for development. Thanks for the time taken to read my email and I trust that these 2 sites be rejected. "

HARTLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Comment Ref: DLPS3250

Hartley Parish Council

"This is an objection submitted on behalf of Hartley Parish Council to the proposed development of sites MX52 and MX53 in the Draft Local Plan. The development put forward in the Plan would involve the extensive development of a large area of the Green Belt which, it is suggested, is justified by 'exceptional circumstances', namely that this quantum of development is necessary to meet the infrastructure deficiencies of Hartley. This is rejected and the attached objection sets out an analysis of the DLP including:- why large scale development should instead be focused on the larger towns in the District;- that the exceptional circumstances put forward do not exist;- that development as proposed would be harmful to the Green Belt, to the village of Hartley, to other settlements in the area, and specifically to the existing network of rural roads,- that there is no justification to remove this area of landscape from the Green Belt given that it still meets the statutory purposes of the Green Belt; Overall there is no justification for large scale large scale development in this area and certainly not in the location(s) proposed. These objections are set out in more detail in the attached documents."

ASH-CUM-RIDLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Comment Ref: DLPS6765

Ash-cum-Ridley Parish (repeated as part of DLPS4553)

"This proposal will result in substantial pressures to the current road and rail services. The route to the A20 is via a country lane. Local bus services will have extended journey times to schools and the station. The loss of local amenity is not outweighed by the provision of un-needed community provisions. Infrastructure benefits Special Educational Needs School (SEN) - this is not a local school as the children qualified to attend come from long distances (up to 50 miles) as the transport, ambulances etc. queuing to come into and out of school demonstrates. The school is rated "Outstanding" in the last two Ofsted inspections. No mention of structural inadequacies has been mentioned in any inspection report. The County Council invested £10 million in the conversion from a mainstream school to equip it for its current use. The school also has a dual use facility with Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council who run a small fitness centre, sharing tennis courts and the sports hall outside of school hours which are used by local people. The Parish Council offices are also located on this site. To transfer this school as suggested would render this site in the Green Belt vulnerable and remove a valued local facility. The Hartley Primary Academy is also rated as "Outstanding" by Ofsted. It is already set in delightful grounds close to the centre of Hartley. Health Centre The areas have two surgeries and the shortage is of doctors which the developers are not offering to provide."

Comment Ref: DLPS6767

Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council (repeated as part of DLPS4553)

"Sports and Social Facilities There are adequate sports and social facilities in Hartley and New Ash Green to support the current population. There is no requirement for an additional community hall as within the conurbation of Longfield, Hartley and New Ash Green there are 6 Village Halls Therefore a significant part of the proposed infrastructure benefits are of little benefit to the existing local populations. The size of the proposed development would lead to coalescence between Hartley, Longfield and Fawkham which the Green Belt aims to prevent."

Comment Ref: DLPS4616

Alison de Jager: Northfield Management Committee

"If allowed, this development would increase the pressure on Northfield, an area leased jointly by Ash-cum-Ridley and Hartley Parish Councils and promoted as a wildlife area."

NEW ASH GREEN VILLAGE ASSOCIATION

Comment Ref: DLPS5271

Pat Kirtley: NEW ASH GREEN VILLAGE ASSOCIATION

"Draft Local Plan Site Ref: MX52 and MX 53 at Corinthians Sports Club and Banckside, Hartley Development of 74.60 Hectares of mixed use land including buildings, agricultural land, sports facilities and Metropolitan Green Belt designated areas into approximately 800 housing units On behalf of the residents of New Ash Green, we are writing to object to the above proposals for the following reasons: Protection of the Green Belt In a recent circular distributed in New Ash Green by our local Councillors it states that the Council is committed to protect our valuable Green belt for generations to come. It also states that over half the District is in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The inclusion of MX52 and MX53 in the Local Plan is in direct contradiction to this statement. The particular area in question includes valuable open landscape, ancient woodlands, wildlife and habitats. We believe that there is no significant justification that warrants the so called 'exceptional circumstances' that would be necessary to release this land from the Green Belt. The Council should be protecting its Green Belt not destroying it. Healthcare Provision The Jubilee Medical Practice has surgeries in New Ash Green and Longfield which are close enough to Hartley so that any further provision is unnecessary. There is no requirement for extra facilities, but there is an urgent requirement now for extra Doctors. Over the years the Practice has had to deal with the extra work resulting from increases in healthcare requirements from care homes, nursing care as well as

care in the community and increased patient care resulting from secondary services and these extra requirements together with the increased housing already in Longfield and Hartley have stretched the local practice to breaking point. Furthermore, there is no evidence at all that there has been any consultation with the local practice about these proposals. It is no good consulting with the Health Authority which would not know about the difficulties that are currently being experienced. We understand that the Group has already stated publicly that it is unlikely that they would have the necessary resources or capacity to take on additional residents as patients. Should this proposal go through, it is difficult to imagine how adequate health provision could be provided for existing patients never mind an extra 2k more. Darent Valley Hospital is already under severe pressure which can only get worse particularly when the Ebbsfleet development of some 14,000 homes gathers momentum. If the proposed retirement village is provided, this would undoubtedly further add to the already creaking health cover in this area. No Council in the land can provide extra Doctors and that is what is needed. Highways and Transport New Ash Green is largely a commuter village with many residents already travelling in and out of the area to work. These proposals would have a serious impact on road travel and the rail services, not to mention the additional parking problems that would be inevitable. Additional housing in the area will add to existing traffic congestion which has increased over the years and is already rendering the Ash Road, being the main through road to Longfield, very busy and at some times it is at a standstill. The road leading from the A20 through to Ash, New Ash Green, Hartley and Longfield is already in difficulty as the current use of sat navs results in huge articulated HGVs driving through what amounts to be a country road with very few passing points, to get to Longfield and through to the M2 and the Dartford Tunnel. Since the advent of Bluewater, the villages of Ash, New Ash Green and Hartley have already seen an increase in traffic because of people cutting through the country lanes to get from the M20, M25, A20 to Bluewater. This Association raised these potential problems when Bluewater was first muted but our points were ignored. Unless there is a substantial improvement to all these access roads there will be an unacceptable strain to the already inadequate road system. We would also question who would pay for an improved road system should these proposals go through? Councils are already cash strapped and road repairs are not considered a priority. To provide better road facilities would also require costs relating to acquiring land no doubt. How would this be funded? There are a lot of questions that do not seem to have been covered. Sports Provision This part of North Kent is more than adequately covered and is well used by local people and by people from outside the area. We do not think there is a need for extra sports facilities and any such proposal would surely detract from existing facilities and could render them eventually unviable. There is also no need for a new Country Park. We are blessed with wonderful countryside and many walks covering a diverse countryside. The cost of maintaining such a new facility would again fall upon residents through council tax and be yet another burden on the local Council. Our residents and those of Hartley enjoy the local footpaths, woodlands and fields that are already available to them – at no cost. Northfield, which is in the ownership of this Association, but managed by the Ash and Hartley Parish Councils is a significant open space and provides good facilities for recreation out doors. Educational Provision We cannot see any justification in relocating the existing two schools and we are unaware of any evidence to support this proposal Any relocation would undeniably result in yet more traffic on the roads as access to the proposed new site could not safely be walked. Currently Hartley Primary Academy is within walking distance for many people, but the proposed new site would be much further away which would not encourage walking. We are aware that the Milestone Academy has had substantial investment in recent years including a hydrotherapy pool – which surely would be extremely costly to relocate to a new site, and be a waste of tax payers money. It should also be noted that the latest Ofsted reports for Hartley Primary Academy and Milestone Academy give both as being 'Outstanding'. We have been unable to identify anything in these reports that indicates that the schools are suffering from a lack of facilities. There is no indication that either of these schools are oversubscribed either. Utilities Whilst this does not immediately effect the village of New Ash Green, we are aware of substantial flooding problems in the Fawkham Valley which happens regularly. Any development in this area would first have to have costly drainage improvements to mitigate the potential for flooding new homes. The Billings Group promotion 'Vision for Hartley' puts forward the proposition that 'the site's location provides excellent access to the strategic road network, including the A2 and the M25 providing direct links to London and the Kent coast. We would submit that this is rubbish! Though the proposals may make it easier to move around the 'bubble(s)' of the two areas of submission, access from them to the A2/M25/A20 is appalling at the moment; an additional 700 odd houses plus other features of the proposal will generate so much more traffic that gridlock in the area is eminently foreseeable. This is most definitely not a sustainable proposal and we sincerely hope that SDC will see sense. "

FAWKHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Comment Ref: DLPS6671

Fawkham Parish Council

"MX52 & MX53 - Corinthians and Bancksides Fawkham Parish Council strongly opposes this development. The concerns of the Fawkham Parish Council are that: The proposed development does not meet the definition of Exceptional Circumstances as provided by SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL and consequently there is no reason why such a development of this size should be considered on green belt land. A vast proportion of the proposed development is in the bounds of Fawkham Village and not in Hartley (as proposed by the developer). Fawkham is a small settlement of approx. 220 houses and 500 people. The existing infrastructure cannot support a development of such magnitude. Fawkham is classed in the Sevenoaks District Council settlement hierarchy as a hamlet. According to this classification such hamlets: "have very small populations (fewer than 1,000 inhabitants) and have limited range of services and facilities. All the settlements in this classification are washed over by green belt. As such it would be unrealistic to expect these to accommodate much new development. "Bearing in mind this classification, the Council questions why such a development has been proposed in the Draft Local Plan. Given the size and scope of the proposed development the Parish Council feel that it is important that more detail is presented on why the Parish Council oppose this development so strongly. Settlement Hierarchy and associated infrastructure. A large proportion of the proposed development in MX52 and MX53 is in Fawkham and not in Hartley as stated by the potential developer. Whilst it is a fact that Hartley will be impacted by the proposals, it is in Fawkham where the majority of the development will take place. One of the major proposals is the development of Corinthians sports ground. Corinthians is in Fawkham and has a Fawkham postal address. Additionally, the proposed country park, relief roads and allotments, are all in Fawkham. Therefore, Fawkham and not Hartley should be used as the settlement for reviewing infrastructure and the impact that the proposed development will have. The Parish Council were curious why the potential developer does not mention Fawkham but describes the area of proposed development as expansion of Hartley. The Parish Council then reviewed the SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL settlement hierarchy classification. In this classification Fawkham is seen as a hamlet and Hartley is seen as a local service centre. This means that Fawkham is at the bottom of the hierarchy whereas Hartley is nearer the top. According to SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL's assessment, Hartley has an infrastructure rating of 41 and Fawkham has a rating of 10. SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL state in their document. "The settlement hierarchy for Sevenoaks District is a key piece of evidence that will be used to prepare the emerging local plan. It helps define the role and function of each settlement within the District. This document will help inform the profile of settlements as well as their capacity to accommodate future development requirements. " "At the top of the hierarchy are the larger settlements that fulfil most functions, have the best infrastructure (facilities and services) and are the most accessible by sustainable forms of transport. The smaller settlements with fewer functions, infrastructure and transport links are nearer to the bottom of the hierarchy. This will help the Council determine which settlements are most suitable to accommodate additional growth". The document also states: These have very small populations (fewer than 1,000 inhabitants) and have limited range of services and facilities. All the settlements in this classification are washed over by green belt. As such it would be unrealistic to expect these to accommodate much new development. "Fawkham Parish Council argue that the majority of the proposed development is in fact in Fawkham and not Hartley. If SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL's own definition of settlement hierarchy is used, there is clearly not enough current infrastructure within Fawkham to sustain such a large development. This reason alone should signify that the proposed development be removed from the Sevenoaks District Draft Local Plan Consultation July 2018. Should the development commence as proposed, then Hartley, Longfield and Fawkham will be merged into one community entity. This wantonly contravenes the National Planning Framework that recommends such settlements retain their own identity. Fawkham is a rural hamlet that includes the Baldwins Green Conversation area. This is a 2.8-hectare area that contains a listed building and is classed as an area of local landscape importance. The lower segment of Castle Hill falls into this area and means that the proposed development of Castle Hill would be in a conservation area. The potential developer promises greater pedestrian access in the new development. To do this in Fawkham would mean widening the road at Valley Road and destroying trees that are in the Baldwin Green conversation area. Valley Road is the main thoroughfare for Fawkham. It is classified by Kent Highways as a single carriageway with 2 lanes (one in either direction). The standard width of such a road is defined as being 5.5 to 7.3m. A minimum width of 5.5m is the accepted width for 2 cars to pass safely at low speed. The potential developer in "A Community Vision for Hartley document state "Valley Road measures approximately 5.5m in width and therefore accommodates two-way traffic flows. "This statement is clearly incorrect. The road is a lot narrower at certain points than the 5.5m stated. A group of

concerned local residents measured the road (see Appendix 3) and found that at many points, especially to the south of the proposed development, the road narrowed to less than 5.5m. Exceptional Circumstances Green Belt In order to build on greenbelt land, it has to be evidenced that exceptional circumstances have been met. Although there is no definition in planning law of exceptional circumstances SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL has stated that they will view exceptional circumstances as: "greenfield green belt sites which provide social and community infrastructure benefits that address genuine needs in the area." Fawkham Parish Council argues that exceptional circumstances are not met in the case of the proposed developments MX52 & MX53 and consequently there is no obligation to develop on this area of greenbelt. Country Park. Fawkham Parish Council are unaware of any request for a Country Park from residents. There is no defined need for this and no justification for the loss of active agricultural land. There are already 6 country parks within 5 miles of both Fawkham and Hartley. The surrounding woodlands of Hartley and Fawkham also provide an opportunity for local residents to enjoy the countryside. The proposed carpark and cafe would add unwanted traffic to the already crowded roads and add to pollution. The proposed development of the country park would spoil the vista of the conservation area of Baldwins Green. Schools. Both Hartley Primary and Milestone schools have an Ofsted rating of Outstanding. This is evidence of the current level of education provided and is regarded as the highest standard and could not be improved by the moving of the schools. The proposed location of the schools is less central to Hartley than the existing one. This would mean that parents who currently walk their children to school may have to drive adding more congestion to the roads. There does not appear to be a shortage of places in local primary schools. This was shown by the fact that a number of local primary schools in the area did not fill their planned admissions number for reception classes last year. Our Lady of Hartley (Ofsted outstanding) made 21 offers compared to 30 places, Horton Kirby and West Kingsdown were also in a similar position. Any shortage would only be caused by the proposed development so if the development does not go ahead there is no need for the moving of the schools. The potential developer does not state whether Fawkham primary school has been consulted. The Parish Council are surprised that this has not been done. As the major proportion of the development is in Fawkham the impact on Fawkham primary school will be huge. With such a proposed development the Parish Council would argue that secondary school provision should be looked at rather than primary education. It is increasingly difficult for local residents to gain the secondary school of their choice especially in the local grammar schools. The proposed development would just make this worse. Sports facilities. The local area is well served for sports facilities. There is no need for the facilities as proposed by the potential developer. There are current sports provisions available at: Corinthians sports ground Fawkham, the Body clinic Fawkham, the boxing stables Fawkham, Brands Hatch Place gym, Hartley Country Club, and the Clockhouse Gym at New Ash Green. A wide variety of exercise classes are offered at the local village halls. A public access gym is situated on the Milestone school site as well as a hydro swimming pool and gym hall. These current sports facilities are currently used by local families in a range of activities such as baby swimming run by Water Babies franchise and gymnastic classes run by Beaming Stars. So, the introduction of any new sports facilities would not be an improvement for local residents as the ones that they use have been taken away. Relief Roads. A new relief road is proposed for Castle Hill. The Parish Council are not sure why this is proposed as it is not needed. The road is not a particularly busy road. It is a narrow road in keeping with the rural hamlet of Fawkham. The bottom half of the road is located in the Baldwins Green conservation area. Any amendment to this road would negatively impact this area. Given the narrow nature of the roads in Fawkham it is unlikely that any of the proposed road improvements could be implemented without the destruction of a large proportion of trees and hedgerows. Pedestrian walk ways and transport. Longfield Southeastern Railway Station is already very overcrowded. Parking in Longfield village is already a problem. The station car parks are becoming increasingly full and could not take the extra capacity that would be caused by the proposed development. This is compounded by the fact that potential developer who is proposing MX52 and MX53 has permission to build 70 apartments on the second station car park. The potential developer suggests that people could walk or cycle to the station with new pedestrian walkways. This would be impractical on the Fawkham side of the development. As evidenced previously in this document, Valley road is just too narrow to facilitate any cycle lanes or pedestrian access. If widening of the road was possible (and it is not), it would mean the purchase of private land some of which is in the conservation area of Baldwins Green. Health Care Provision. There is a need for more GPs in the area. The Jubilee Medical Practice has recently undergone recruitment exercise and new GPs have just been recruited which is positive. The nationwide shortfall of GPs will not be solved by building a new medical centre. Indeed, a new medical centre may even compound the problem by creating local competition for GPs. On the website "A vision for Hartley", the potential developer states that they have worked in partnership with Jubilee Medical group to provide a new GP surgery. They also state that a 7 day, 8am- 8pm Health Care Centre is proposed in response to local needs. Fawkham Parish Council are unaware of such local needs. The Jubilee Medical Group issued a statement that

contradicted the potential developers. They stated that they have had no formal involvement with the proposals and it is unlikely that they have the resources or capacity to take on the new residents. The Jubilee Medical Group stated they were not aware of any planned extra provision for 8-8 seven-day week services and this is not something that they would provide directly. It does appear that the potential developer has just placed the health centre on their wish list to meet the criteria of exceptional circumstances rather than consult with partners and work on a concrete proposal. The Parish Council would argue that in the area of medical provision it is tertiary rather than primary care that should be reviewed. Darent Valley hospital which services the local area is currently running over budget. They are struggling to meet the demand created by the new development in Ebbsfleet. This means that they are nearing their upper level in maternity services. A development the scale as proposed would have a major impact on the hospital. The Parish Council understand that SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL has not consulted or approached Darent Valley Hospital to discuss such an impact before including MX52 and MX53 on the draft plan. This does appear to be a serious oversight. Allotments. The local residents have no need for additional allotments. This proposal is just a box ticking exercise for the potential developer to try and justify that the development on the green belt meets exceptional circumstances. The majority of houses in Fawkham are lucky enough to have enough outside space to be able to grow their own vegetables or plants if they so wish. There are already 2 allotment sites (Woodland Avenue allotments and Ash Road allotments) in Hartley. The proposed site of the allotments is currently used as playing fields and forestry school for Steephill School. The introduction of allotments on this site, far from meeting a need, would actually take away valuable outside space where local children play and develop. Community Centre. There are currently 5 community centres/village halls in the locality. The Parish Council are currently trying to encourage more people to use the village hall in Fawkham. There is no need for any more such facilities in the area. It is opinion of Fawkham Parish Council that the potential developer has just suggested these proposals to tick the box of exceptional circumstance rather than address genuine local needs. The Parish Council would also argue that in the area of medical provision it is tertiary rather than primary care that should be reviewed. Darent Valley hospital which services the local area is currently running over budget. They are struggling to meet the demand created by the new development in Ebbsfleet. This means that they are nearing their upper level in maternity services. A development the scale as proposed would have a major impact on the hospital. The Parish Council understand that SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL has not consulted or approached Darent Valley Hospital to discuss such an impact before including MX52 and MX53 on the draft plan. This does appear to be a serious oversight."

LOCAL SEVENOAKS COUNCILLORS

Comment Ref: DLPS6792

Cllr Alan Pett: Sevenoaks District Council

"The proposals under MX52 & MX53, HO384 and MX55 that are in or would have a substantial impact upon my ward (Ash & New Ash Green) are NOT supported. Specifically, MX52 & MX53 represent a substantial increase in the number of dwellings in Hartley and Fawkham, which have to be seen in the context of the settlements of New Ash Green (within Sevenoaks District) AND the neighbouring Longfield and New Barn (in Dartford Borough). These settlements are all constrained – strangled – by a wholly inadequate highway infrastructure, well described by other respondents to this consultation. I would add that before the development of New Ash Green began, the developer – SPAN (Kent) – wrote to KCC as highways authority pointing out that the southerly South Ash Road access to the A20 was wholly inadequate for the new development and needed improvement. Over 50 years later, with the number of cars per household rising from less than 1 per household to the three or more currently (and of increased width), NOTHING has been done to improve this route. What might be regarded as a 'rat run' by some, but a necessity in reality, by way of Billet Hill/Rogerswood Lane northbound to the A20 is even more limited (size) and limiting (capacity). Routes to the north from New Ash Green/Hartley/Longfield are little different. The northerly routes have also to be seen in the context of major developments at Ebbsfleet Garden City and elsewhere. Provision of "improvement to local roads" within MX52 & MX53 does not address the lack of capacity outside identified above, and by others. The Billings group document supporting the proposal is a splendid example of creative writing. e.g. Hartley Primary School is oversubscribed. This is the case for virtually all of the primary schools in the District, as it is a measure of all applications, whether first choice or otherwise, to a particular school. It does not indicate a lack of school capacity. Building another school with greater capacity in Hartley will lead to falling rolls elsewhere, and pressure for school closure(s), with consequent waste of public funds. Similarly, additional medical facilities are not the solution to a lack of provision (buildings) in the area; it is the lack of doctors and other medical staff that is the issue, here as elsewhere in the district. (see Dr Andrew

Dott's submission.) There is problem nationally with recruiting Gps. Solving problem this is the answer, not more surgeries. There is much emphasis on providing additional recreational facilities within the area of these proposals. It is submitted that existing facilities in the wider area are more than adequate, and that the provision of more will lead to under-utilisation of all, with higher unit costs or financial failure. Surely this is not the way to plan facilities! Though efforts have been made to 'spin' this application, I do not believe that the "exceptional circumstances" test has been satisfied. The Fawkham valley is one of the few unspoiled areas in the district, in my opinion, and the development proposed must inevitably be visible and detrimental to this attractive landscape by virtue of being on a hillside, notwithstanding the mitigation that can be achieved by landscaping, compared with that of New Ash Green, for example, which is essentially situated on a plateau and virtually invisible from all directions from PROW. "

Comment Ref: DLPS6789

Cllr James Gaywood: Sevenoaks District Council

"To Mr Richard Morris Chief Planning Officer Sevenoaks District Council Sites MX52 and MX53 Re Council Draft Plan 2018 Dear Richard, I am writing to you in relation to the recent Draft Plan of the Sevenoaks District, and in particular with reference to the Hartley and Fawkham wards. Please accept this mail as my official objection to the draft plan for these two wards.. These two wards are in fact quite separate from each other, Hartley being conjoined with Hodsell Street, in the District of Sevenoaks, and Fawkham in the District of Sevenoaks. However, the applicant has chosen to lodge his proposals as one with SDC, possibly because they cover both areas, and perhaps dependent on each other. Whatever, the SDC appears to accept this situation. After having studied the potential impacts of such a development, I have come to the inevitable conclusion that the applicant's proposal has no validity what so ever, on several counts: a) The land in discussion is prime Green Belt. b) None of the Exceptional Circumstances required for building on Green Belt land appears to apply to this proposal. c) The construction of such development would mean that Hartley, Fawkham, and neighbouring villages such as Longfield, New Ash Green, would be virtually conjoined, defeating the purpose of the Green Belt. The developer has cited the following as being Exceptional Circumstances – 1. The building of two new schools in Fawkham, replacing the one in Hartley, and the one in Hartley near New Ash Green. However, these two schools are in fine fettle, do not need replacing, and therefore no necessity for children to travel further to school than they already do. 2. The construction of a new medical centre. This would be entirely unnecessary, as medical buildings are not what the locality needs. It needs additional Doctors. 3. New Sports Facilities. No need for this. The immediate locality has many facilities available, such as football, rugby, tennis, golf, bowls, squash etc. 4. Two relief roads. Totally unnecessary and anti social. One of the relief roads would run through a small group of private houses, and would be disturbed by much traffic, including juggernauts and farm vehicles. 5. A small country park. Again not required or needed. The whole of Fawkham Valley can be considered as a natural country park. I have lived in Hartley since 1963, and have always considered it to be a most pleasing village. Fawkham, which was at one time in the same ward as Hartley, is not much more than a Hamlet, in one of the most beautiful parts of Kent. Many of us in Hartley regard Fawkham as a twin. Fawkham, where it is proposed to build some 550 new houses in the valley at present is made up of less than 200 houses, and around 400 inhabitants. It is not difficult to calculate that the population could increase by about 300% and houses could increase similarly. The remaining +250 houses are planned to be built in Hartley, again in the Valley, adding to the large volume already planned for Fawkham. This land has previously been refused by SDC for development. Finally, the impact on the infrastructure (all country roads), the local train station in Longfield, and the already over-crammed shopping centre and parking facilities in Longfield village, and access to Fawkham and Hartley particularly from the A20 in the south, via Ash Road South and /or Fawkham Road, are issues to be feared if this project were to be allowed. The above, if it ever took place, would be unbearable, in my view, to a large majority of the existing residents of Hartley, Fawkham and Longfield and other outlying areas. Finally I confirm that I firmly object to this development taking place. "

Comment Ref: DLPS982

Cameron Clark

"This is a very significant development proposal for which no adequate justification has been given to warrant the 'exceptional circumstances' that would be necessary to release the land from the Green Belt. Without details of the viability of the new infrastructure and the community benefits referred to it is difficult to understand how the major constraints could be overcome. There is already a large residential complex with 210 homes for older

people at Bramblefield in Hartley, adjacent to MX53, so additional provision close by may not be justifiable. The Jubilee Medical Group has surgeries in New Ash Green and Longfield which are sufficiently close to render further provision in Hartley unnecessary. Both the existing doctors' surgeries are close to bus stops; the site for the proposed satellite health centre will not be accessible by public transport. The Group is already experiencing problems attracting and retaining staff for their two sites with more than the ideal 1,800 patients for each GP so it would be difficult to spread their resources to a third satellite facility. The Group has stated publicly that it is unlikely that they, or other neighbouring practices, would have the necessary resources or capacity to take on the additional new residents as patients. The additional population would stretch whatever staff they can recruit even further to the detriment of the whole area and whilst the Group would want to work with any developer if the plans are approved to ensure adequate health provision for new and existing residents they have had no formal involvement with the project. In addition, the BMI Fawkham Manor Hospital is only about 1Km distant and offers a number of procedures for NHS patients which cannot be provided by the GPs' surgeries. Darent Valley Hospital is already under pressure and cannot cope with existing demands, even without the need to provide for the Ebbsfleet developments, so a further substantial population increase without a contribution towards improved hospital facilities will be to the detriment of the local community. If the suggested retirement village is implemented, that would be likely to add a disproportionate requirement for health services. A road route through MX52 from Ash Road to Valley Road may be physically possible as a means of diverting some traffic away from Hartley but would require the use of a significant amount of recreational and potential development land as well as the improvement of parts of Valley Road outside the control of the site owner, and a new junction on Ash Road. This road, and its Ash Road junction, would also cut into the site proposed as HO353 so if that site, identified as a Green Category, is included in the plan and developed it would not be possible to use most of it for any improvements to the major road network. Any benefits from this road would be overwhelmingly outweighed by the destruction of open Green Belt land necessary to pay for it. The suggested access via Parkfield to MX53 passes through a residential area and is not suitable for significant extra traffic, particularly if it could then be used as a cut-through to Valley Road by traffic avoiding Longfield. The steep, winding route to the valley bottom would be hazardous, especially in icy weather, in the same way that Hoselands Hill on Ash Road suffers at present. The narrowness of Castle Hill acts as a disincentive to people using it as a rat run but if a road of standard width is provided through the site from Parkfield to Valley Road such use of this road would be an unavoidable consequence. As with the link from Ash Road to Valley Road through MX52, Valley Road would need improvement to cope with additional traffic and the loss of so much Green Belt land to development in order to finance a viable road scheme would be unacceptable. Both these road proposals would only divert traffic onto unsuitable local roads with consequent adverse impacts on safety. The transportation assessment is also suspect because there is no bus service on Valley Road and much of the developable area of MX53 would be more than 400m from the nearest bus stop. MX52, including the proposed retirement village is even less accessible. Buses only run to a few potential destinations and their frequencies are sporadic. Public transport for most of the new housing, including the proposed retirement village, would not be a viable option. As at present, many new residents would use the railway for commuting to London, Bromley or Medway but peak-time buses to Longfield station are few and far between and at all times buses are unreliable because of traffic congestion, so most people would drive to the station where car parking is already difficult. Additional housing in the area will only add to traffic congestion unless major improvements to the wider road network are carried out, including the Lower Thames Crossing. Walking or cycling is only an option for the fittest because of the hilly topography. The local road network is already under pressure, especially those leading north and south from the Longfield/Hartley/New Ash Green area. All have pinch points where two large vehicles cannot pass each other and some, notably South Ash Road and Ash Lane, are only single track in places despite carrying a heavy volume of traffic. Unless significant improvements can be made to all these roads, an increase of around a third in the number of dwellings in Hartley will place an intolerable strain on these inadequate roads. The existing sports provision is well used by people from a wide area, including outside the District and it is difficult to understand how this already extensive use could be improved when so much of the area would be taken up with some 800 residential units and some facilities, such as the golf course which is an appropriate use of Green Belt land, would be removed. The viability of other local sports facilities could be impacted by new competing facilities as there is no evidence of a current need for more provision. Three areas of allotments already exist: within 150m east of MX52 in Hartley and both north and east of MX53 in Longfield and Hartley respectively, each of them only some 700m away, so the need for more is not proven. Although a replacement primary school and special educational needs school are suggested, there is no evidence that existing local provision would benefit from replacement whilst any additional needs could be more easily provided on the existing sites. Hartley Primary Academy is within walking distance of the majority of people in Hartley but the proposed new site would be significantly further

from the great majority of the existing population and in a location only accessible by a steep hill so it would not encourage sustainable travel – the measured straight-line distances used to justify the location take no account of the topography which would be a great disincentive to walking. There is no evidence that the parents and pupils of the present school would support the move to a new site nor that there is an existing need in the community sufficient to justify a 50% increase in the size of the primary school. The location of the schools will lead to a high demand for vehicular collection and drop-off facilities for use by parents and minibuses. Milestone Academy, on the edge of New Ash Green, draws many of the large numbers of staff needed for this specialist facility from the immediate area, again within walking distance, but they would not be able to travel to the proposed site on foot or by public transport, so this sustainable aspect of its present site would be lost. Milestone Academy draws its pupils from a wide area of North Kent so its redevelopment could only be claimed as advantageous for a very small number of people in the immediate area; an important aspect of its work is the teaching of life skills to the children and they are often seen walking on shopping trips to New Ash Green village centre – this would not be possible from the proposed location. Milestone Academy has been fitted out with expensive facilities such as a hydrotherapy pool which will be very costly to replicate on a new site. It also has dual use sports facilities available to the community, at the Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council's sports centre; these are within easy reach on foot for New Ash Green residents so the continuation of this essential, local and conveniently-located public facility would be under threat if the school were to be resited. Milestone Academy has a very high staff:pupil ratio and the numbers of staff lead to a high car parking requirement which, added to the Primary Academy's staff parking, could not be met within the suggested site. Drainage of both foul and storm water is under pressure in the Fawkham Valley and Longfield with old infrastructure and regular flooding during storms. Any development of this scale would require the expensive complete renewal of the downstream infrastructure which will have a major impact on the viability of the development and the possibility of it delivering the promised community benefits. The proposed site for the country park is currently productive agricultural land and there is no justification for changing its status, particularly as the surrounding landscape can already be enjoyed from the footpaths crossing this and other parts of the site. There are already many country parks within easy reach of the villages of Longfield and Hartley, including Lullingstone, Shorne, Trosley, Beacon Wood, Darenth and Camer Parks, some of which have visitor facilities including cafés but it is noteworthy that only the larger of these can support extensive staffed facilities and there is no evidence that the proposed small 14ha country park on the MX53 site in Hartley/Fawkham would be able to offer the added value for sufficient numbers of visitors to make facilities such as a café viable. Its maintenance would be a continuing financial burden on the community. There are also many community woodlands nearby at, for example, Jeskyns (Forestry Commission), Saxten's & Cage's Woods and Wilmay Copse in Fawkham (Woodlands Trust), Oldbury Hill (National Trust), Ashenbank Wood (Woodlands Trust), Preston Hill (Kent CC), Holly Hill (Tonbridge & Malling BC), Farningham Woods (Sevenoaks DC) and the extensive woodlands around New Ash Green, including Barnet's Wood within Northfield in Hartley. Northfield itself is a significant community open space managed by Hartley and Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Councils and already provides excellent facilities for open-air recreation. The reference to "scenic views" used to justify the creation of the country park actually applies to most of the two sites where re-entrants lead off the main valley towards the more developed plateau area of Hartley that is currently largely screened by woodland along the top of the valley sides. The development of these two sites would wrap around three sides of the Grade I listed medieval church of St Mary and its surrounding conservation area, destroying its setting and breaking its link with the rest of Fawkham village. There is no evidence of any significant changes in the original reasoning for the designation of this land as Green Belt which would justify its release from the Green Belt now nor that the provision of a small country park "would maintain the openness [sic] of the Green Belt land in perpetuity" when much of the rest of the two sites would be covered with suburban-type development. Neither site is a sustainable location and it is surprising that a prominent location in the Green Belt which strongly defines the edge of existing settlements, prevents the coalescence of neighbouring villages and provides recreational facilities is described as weakly performing Green Belt land. Suggested community benefits like the outdoor events arena, community centre, outdoor gym and village green do not meet any evidenced local need and these facilities already exist, when required, on other public land in the locality. A community centre that is at the bottom of a valley, remote from any housing apart from a small number of the proposed new houses and with no public transport, will not meet any community need. It is also worth noting that whilst the 800 new residential units would, in mathematical terms, be a welcome addition to the District's housing stock and would contribute towards meeting the identified housing need, the location of the housing is also a factor that must be considered in determining the viability and suitability of developments. These sites are at the northernmost extremity of Sevenoaks District, 200m from the boundary at its closest point. They are consequently remote from the greater part of the District where the most pressing housing need in the District is likely to arise. A development of this scale will be seen in the broader

context as more closely related to the Thameside/Ebbsfleet housing developments which are only a short distance to the north and it would be more likely to attract people interested in that area than from the parts of Sevenoaks which have the greatest housing need. The ability of these sites to contribute significantly towards meeting the housing need in Sevenoaks District is therefore questionable and their development may actually draw in people from across the boundary to add to the housing pressures. The Implementation Framework for the Ebbsfleet development area emphasises the creation of enhanced connections to the Green Belt footpath network to the south via a sustainable walking and cycling network which includes the area encompassed by these proposals. This Green Belt land should therefore be protected as part of the rural buffer to underline the distinction between the Ebbsfleet development area, just 2½ miles to the north, and the remainder of the Kent countryside. There are few, if any, evidenced infrastructure benefits to justify any development and the location of these sites is within a significant part of the Green Belt that safeguards the countryside from encroachment and checks the unrestricted sprawl of the combined settlements of Hartley and Longfield towards the scattered rural village of Fawkham, surrounding its isolated medieval church and associated Conservation Area, whilst already providing appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and recreation. It is by no means a "logical extension to the existing built confines of Hartley" because of the natural landscape break at the edge of the plateau. There are insufficient 'exceptional circumstances' in these proposals to trump the continuing benefits of this Green Belt land. New developments on brownfield sites in Ebbsfleet and Thameside where the provision of affordable housing is an integral part of those developments, are much better placed to meet local housing needs. Neither of these sites in Hartley and Fawkham is therefore suitable for inclusion as a housing or mixed use site in the Local Plan. "

LOCAL KCC COUNCILLOR

Comment Ref: DLPS1584

David Brazier

"I write to comment on the Draft Local Plan so far as it involves New Ash Green, Hartley and Fawkham. My principal concern is that the highway network is inadequate to support substantial further residential development:1. Ash Road through Hartley is congested, particularly at the beginning and end of the school day i.e. the rush hour. Most of its length has no parking restrictions and a single in judiciously parked car can cause long traffic queues to form. I have witnessed queues stretching from the Post Office to the Milestone School roundabout causing long delays to road users because of a single parked car.2. Castle Hill is of a single vehicle's width but serves as the only connector between Ash Road and Valley Road. It is prone to congestion and "Mexican Stand-offs" when vehicles meet. This is distressing to residents, especially when their drives are used as passing places.3. Valley Road. This road serves a strategic purpose and is used by heavy vehicles that find it difficult to pass. The road has many bends with poor visibility and is often driven too fast. It is unsuitable for any growth in traffic numbers.4. The Street, South Ash Road and Ash Lane. This length of highway has not been improved and remains a country lane, although used by many vehicles including articulated HGVs that ignore the advisory sign at the junction with the A20, principally because there is no alternative. This already causes congestion that results in motorists turning round to find another route. Most of the verge, where it exists, is privately owned, and widening would be expensive and disruptive. If there is significant development in Hartley, Fawkham and New Ash Green the weight of traffic on The Street, South Ash Road and Ash Lane would worsen a situation that many residents already consider intolerable.5. Billet Hill, Rogers Wood Lane, Michaels Lane, Manor Lane and Fawkham Green Road. Although of a single vehicle's width these roads can't handle heavy traffic from Hartley, New Ash Green and Ash to the A20 and the southbound M25 because there are no alternatives. Excepting the widening of Ash Road through Hartley in the 1960's and the widening of Chapel Wood Road to form the New Ash Green by-pass, there have been no significant improvements to highway infrastructure in living memory while residential development has been very substantial. The Draft Local Plan should only accommodate further development if there is widespread upgrading of local infrastructure. This would need to be funded by developer contributions. What has been proposed to date by prospective developers would be quite inadequate."

LOCAL MP

Comment Ref: DLPS324

Gareth Johnson: Member of Parliament for Dartford

"I would be grateful if you would accept this letter as notification of my formal objection to the proposals to include the above sites in the Local Plan. I do not believe that very exceptional circumstances have been established to show that development on this part of the green belt is appropriate. Further, I believe that these proposals do not have an adequate regard for the needs of the local community. I make these objections fully recognising that there is a need for more housing in the Sevenoaks District. It is entirely right that all communities within Sevenoaks should be assessed for their suitability for development. Further, all communities should take their fair share of new homes, where those homes can be provided in a sustainable way and one that adequately protects our green belt. These proposals are neither sustainable nor fair on the people of Hartley and the wider area. The proposal, of up to 800 new homes, represents an increase of around a third of the existing homes in Hartley. For a village the size of Hartley, the impact of this will be significant and would change the character of the village forever. The suggestion by DHA planning that Hartley and Longfield should be viewed as an "interconnected community", thus allowing the proposed development to be viewed against a background population of 10,000 plus, rather than 5,600 is flawed. The quoted population for Longfield, appears to be for the parish, thus including the significantly larger, and more populous area of New Barn, which is some distance from Hartley. Hartley is a distinct village and its rural location gives it a unique character, entirely distinct from Longfield which lies within a different borough and across a railway line. I am concerned that the land at Corinthians previously appears to have been deemed unsuitable for development for some 300 residential units, yet is being proposed for inclusion in the local plan, for a significantly increased number. Specifically, the site was found to be "unsuitable for this scale of development given its rural location, encroachment into the countryside and loss of sports facilities". The document also referenced the isolation of the site and "it was not possible to see how the site could be integrated into Hartley". Turning to the proposals in relation to the Bancksides site, it is unclear as to the number of units proposed, based on the amalgamation of both sites for the purposes of the consultation. Whilst I appreciate that this is not a planning application, I believe that clear information needs to be provided to residents about the proposal for this site. The DHA document suggests this part of the development would provide "up to 230 new dwellings" (page 17), the illustrative layout on the same page, shows only 100 homes, and the number of units is listed as 150 on page 26 of the same document. The approximate yield is estimated at 141-188 residential units, although DHA's documentation appear to suggest the figure is closer to 114. Given that the two sites appear to have been amalgamated for the purposes of this consultation, I would be grateful for any clarification that can be provided on this issue so that my constituents are best able to respond to these proposals. I have significant concerns for the residents of Bancksides, Downs Valley and Parkfield. This proposal not only means an increase in the number of vehicles using Parkfield to access any new development, but, in the event that the development were to exceed 50 units, it is suggested that additional access would be required. In the event that this additional access were to link to Ash Road and Fawkham Road, via an extension to Parkfield, this road would become a significant rat run. The change in character for this minor residential road would be substantial. I am disappointed that DHA, who act on behalf of the Billings Group, did not seek to notify me of their proposals at any stage of the process, had they done so, I would have had the opportunity to raise my concerns with them directly. I believe that the lack of engagement demonstrates a worrying approach to community enhancement. It is astounding that they claim that the project would enhance the local community but have not consulted community representative beforehand. I do not believe the proposed development by Bancksides would enhance the local community. Having represented the village of Hartley for over eight years, I have never heard of a single resident express a desire to see a country park built in the village. This aspect of the proposal falls significantly short of the threshold required for development on green belt land and therefore should be rejected. I have been contacted by a significant number of local residents who oppose this development. There is a clear view, amongst the people who live in the village, that this development would have a negative impact on the village, its environment and its infrastructure. I therefore request the Local Plan does not include this proposal. "

LOCAL RETIRED DOCTORS

Comment Ref: DLPS2698 (also repeated as DLPS1785 and DLPS1564 and DLPS 1875)

Mrs Jeanne Dott

"OBJECTION Sites MX52 and MX53 I have lived in Hartley for 36 years and it was my privilege and pleasure to serve the community as local GP as did my husband and also to work as a Forensic Physician for Kent Constabulary for many years. Whilst I wholeheartedly agree with all the previous objections made by residents I wish to particularly emphasise the problems this proposed development will cause to public services and draw upon my

many years of experience working within the geographical area and consulting with local residents. In my view the infrastructure does not support the proposed development :1.The Fawkham Valley Road frequently floods and becomes impassable in winter.2.There are no pavements to allow safe pedestrians, pushchair or disabled wheelchair access to the site.3.The roadway alterations proposed will tear through the heart of the village and cause heavy pressure on the Ash Road and Fawkham Valley Road.4.Longfield Station already cannot provide sufficient parking and there is nowhere else for additional parking in Longfield for commuters and this expansion will create chaos. There is also no disabled access to the platforms for those with special needs attending the school they need to travel to Meopham station.5. Elderly housing in this new area would be dangerously distant from any shopping and other community areas leading to social isolation and the concomitant health risks which are well documented when this occurs. The contrast of action packed busy school terms versus the quiet of school holidays will exaggerate this loneliness. The provision of public services are already stretched to serve the area:1.The local GP practice is struggling to provide a service and recruitment and retention is at an all-time low - three GPs have recently left and not wholly been replaced. When such developments are proposed GPs are never consulted and already they are distressed at not feeling able to provide the service they feel their residents need and deserve. The practice already is stretched to cover two sites and the Health Authority recognise this by supporting extra staff funding BUT this does not include the most necessary staff -the GPs. Three sites would be impossible. Two pharmacists are located in Longfield close to the GP surgery not in the middle of Fawkham.2.We are geographically distant from Ebbsfleet police station and Swanley so response time is poor and there has been a recent increase in burglaries in the area to which many of us have fallen victim. It is ironic that the community police houses have been sold off to "centralise" provision of services and then this huge expansion is suggested.3.Ambulance response time is longer to the area because of geographical distance and small roads leading into Hartley -the proposal does not include changes to these, so many of which have small hazardous passing places eg Billet Hill and Rogers Wood from the A20 and South Ash Road. For this reason we as a practice declined obstetric home deliveries despite the fact that when working in Gravesend I supported and provided the service. It is just not safe when attendance time is delayed.4. I challenge any evidence to support that the move of the "Outstanding" Hartley Primary School and integration on the new site will maintain educational standards for the children and parents who support them. For many parents that currently walk to and from school and support and encourage a healthy lifestyle for themselves and their children this will change to driving to and from school creating road pressure, pollution, danger and unhealthier lifestyle. Bicycle access would be extremely dangerous on roads such as Castle Hill."•"I 'Finally I would like to add that in my many years of service to the community I was always delighted to witness the supportive, cohesive, collaborative village spirit always demonstrated by the residents of Hartley and that is why we chose to live where we worked and since retirement to stay within the area. We love the area, we are passionate about protecting the green belt and ecosystems and we must fight to retain the beautiful village of Hartley and it's fine residents from this grotesque expansion proposal."

Comment Ref: DLPS2697 (also repeated as DLPS1639 and DLPS1565)

Dr Andrew G Dott

"I am writing to add my name to those objecting to the above proposals which will add 800 new houses to our community and consequently change forever the present village of Hartley. The result of agreeing to these plans will, as many in our community have stated in writing and at public meetings, have a major impact on local services to their detriment. My expertise is in the field of general practice and i have recently retired from the group practice serving this area continuously for 35 years. I have lived in Hartley all that time and plan to continue living in Hartley. In that time the practice has had to absorb the extra workload of care homes ,nursing homes as well as the policy of care in the community and ever increasing numbers of patient care devolved from secondary services. The assumption that any development can be adequately covered by existing medical services is flawed or even negligent and a consultation should be had and agreement made with the local service provider i.e. the Jubilee Medical Group and not the Health Authority before planning permission is granted .The crisis of recruitment and retention in general practice only add to the problems which I understand is not something that Sevenoaks planners are able to change but must be something that at this stage (with the whole NHS in some crisis and most especially locally) must be considered. I would add my voice to those others stating the impact on our community with regards to rail services, police services, other emergency services i.e. ambulance and fire fighters all of which would be adversely affected to the point of danger."

Comment Ref: DLPS4572

Paul and Yvonne Davies

"Re: Draft Local Plan Site Ref MX52 and MX53 Land at Corinthians Sports Club and Banckside, Hartley: Development of 74.60 Hectares of mixed use land including buildings, agricultural land, sports facilities and Metropolitan Green Belt designated areas into approximately 800 housing units. We wish to object, on the following grounds, to the plans to expand Hartley and Fawkham, as outlined in the draft local plan. 1. The proposed 800 homes will increase the population of the area by at least 2000, impacting on the rural environment. There is no requirement for a Country Park, there are already Woodland Trust areas (50 acres of Ancient Woodland in Fawkham) for people to walk and explore nature in the immediately local area and there are a number of Country Parks within a 3- 7 mile radius of Hartley and Fawkham. 2. The area is green belt and for development to go ahead - exceptional circumstances have to be proved - there is no evidence to support that this requirement has been met. 3. The road and transport infrastructure is currently inadequate to support the existing population. Castle Hill which communicates between Fawkham Valley and Ash Road, Hartley is a narrow, single track, country lane with a number of blind bends. Fawkham Valley Road is a Class C road and in parts only 4 m wide. There is a Primary School located along this road, it does not have any pavements and additional traffic would cause both safety and environmental issues. It is already under stress particularly at commuting times. Ash Road has seen a number of severe and fatal accidents over recent years. 4. HEALTHCARE PROVISION - EXPERT LOCAL KNOWLEDGE - the local area has one General Practice providing General Medical Services to over 18000 patients on two sites. As local GPs in the area for over 30 years, we have first hand experience of the impact of new developments on the ability to meet the health needs of the population. The current services are at breaking point and any additional increase in list size is likely to be catastrophic. The feasibility of providing these to the population from one site has been explored on numerous occasions, but due to a number of reasons, including the poor public transport in the area, the demographics of the population, the provision of local pharmacy services and identification of a site which is accessible to the majority of patients it has not been possible to take this forward. The surgery currently only has 4 GP Partners (non salaried), compared to 9 Partners 4 years ago. There has been a significant turnover in staff and difficulty in recruiting and retaining both medical and non medical staff. This is recognised as a National problem. The current practice is not able to fully meet the needs of the existing population, let alone those of any additional residents. The current surgeries have a total of 17 Consulting rooms, the provision of new premises with more consulting rooms would not address any of the health issues of the community. 5. The areas of Fawkham, Hartley and Longfield are all distinctly different from one another. One of the aims of the NPPF is to restrict neighbouring villages and towns from merging into one - these proposed developments will do the exact opposite to the aim. 6. Parking in Longfield has become increasingly difficult with the restrictions on the roads and in the Waitrose car park (which used to be a public car park). Additional cars will put further pressure on this. "

STEEPHILL SCHOOL

Comment Ref: DLPS5809

Edward Oatley (Chairman of the Board of Governors), Caroline Birtwell (Headteacher), Steephill School
"Re Sevenoaks Draft Local Plan 2015-2035-Site Ref HO162/HO163 MX52/MXS3 -Corinthians and Banckside The Board of Governors of this School are writing to formally object to the proposals concerning the above sites in the Local Plan. The proposals are not demonstrating a need by the local community for exceptional circumstances in which to overturn the building restrictions on green belt and area of outstanding natural beauty. The National Planning Policy framework According to the NPPF, there are five stated purposes of including land within the green belt: • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include: • Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population • Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas • The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live • Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns • The securing of nature conservation interests • The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses. The proposals are in direct conflict with these stated aims and also with the Hartley Village Design Statement which was put together by a large number of local people and experts. There is no need for local housing, another GP surgery, another country park, more primary school places. The removal of Milestone School to another site is also unnecessary. 1. The increase in size of the Hartley Primary School is

unlikely to be filled by the number of houses being built as 180 children of the correct age group (30 in each age group) will be necessary. Therefore Fawkham Primary School will be under threat. And the increase in size is an unnecessary cost. 2. There is no need for another country park as there are several country parks within the area none of which are overly used and therefore it would be far better to preserve green belt instead which has numerous walking opportunities. 3. Milestone School already exists and has excellent resources and facilities. These having had a multi-million pound upgrade very recently. There can be no good reason to move it. 4. The addition of Milestone Special Needs School to a complex will be detrimental to those individuals who attend as they need space, time and individual attention and not to be mixed in with huge crowds. 5. The added traffic to Fawkham Valley Road will exacerbate the already terrible traffic problem along that road. The road is very narrow, especially with blind spots, sharp bends and is used as a run for many delivery lorries between the A20 and Gravesend. 6. Schoolchildren should have the opportunity to walk to school - an initiative championed by many a Health Minister. Moving the primary school away from Hartley will prevent future children from doing so. 7. The increase in housing in this area will put further strain on hospital care which is already under threat. 8. The water supply is limited in the Hartley area. These new houses constitute a third increase and therefore the water supply, together with other amenities will be under duress. In particular to this School: 1. The number of cars parking at school times and during funerals, weddings etc are already causing congestion. The proposal seeks to build directly next to the church car-park and indeed on some of it. This will mean that parents of the School, dog-walkers, church-goers will be forced to park along the lanes which are only wide enough for one car. The added traffic from the houses will then make this worse. 2. The access to the School is down a one-car width lane and parking along it will be a serious Health and Safety issue as emergency vehicles will not be able to reach the School. 3. The proposal outlines allotments on land which is currently used by the School for sports. Whilst this land belongs to the developers and they may be able to refuse to renew our lease when it is up in 9 years time, it is worrying that land adjacent to school would compromise the privacy and possibly the Health and Safety of the pupils at this School. 4. The relief road running alongside the school's sportsground will affect the air quality. On a more pastoral note, the School teaches about the importance of wildlife and the importance of keeping to the law of the land. These proposals contravene the conservation laws which were put in to place exactly to stop this suburban sprawl destroying local flora and fauna and therefore destroys both of these important principles. "

Comment Ref: DLPS4965

Sevenoaks District Council

"SDC received 87 letters and drawings from pupils of Steephill School. These will be included as part of the draft Local Plan consultation."

OTHER

Comment Ref: DLPS6388

Revd. Jim Fletcher

"Talking with many of my Parishioners, I know you will have received plenty of lengthy emails and letters objecting to the draft local plans for developing Hartley, so I will attempt to keep this short. However, I hope the amount and length of objections to this proposal will show to the authorities the level of concern these plans has caused. Fawkham and Hartley is a unique Parish and these plans will certainly put its identity under threat. Although I have sympathy that the authorities are under pressure to build more homes, I wish to add to these objections as Fawkham and Hartley does not have the infrastructure to cope with more houses and especially the increase in vehicles on the roads. As someone who daily travels round the two villages I am amazed at how bad the pressure on the roads is already. Certainly, Valley Road through Fawkham is not coping with the amount of traffic that currently uses it. More homes and the proposed change of location of two local schools would add a horrendous amount of pressure to this area. As someone who regularly visits the local schools with my work, I'd like to note that in my opinion both schools are perfectly acceptable as they are. The proposed location for the two schools, would in my opinion be a difficult place for parents and children to reach easily. I can foresee huge traffic congestion in this area even with a new road being built. The local Medical Centre and Darent Valley Hospital are already stretched to the limit so would there be a guarantee of a new Medical Centre when our local one is seemingly struggling to attract new Doctors? Has consideration been made for extra buses and trains locally if this plan went through? I am personally not in favour as well due to the extra pollution that will be brought to the area. People have particularly moved here for a more rural atmosphere where as these plans

threaten to turn the area in to a more suburban one. I also thought Greenbelt land could only be touched in exceptional circumstances which I personally do not think is the case in this instance. I feel our residents need to be given the facts about whether other local areas have better facilities to cope with this type of change. Most upsetting with these plans is that news has travelled more through 'word of mouth' rather than something official. I feel something of this extreme level should warrant the District Council leaflet dropping every house in the Parish with the full facts. It is also upsetting for the people of Fawkham to see this being called 'Hartley Expansion' when this development affects the people of Fawkham just as much as Hartley. I really hope you will consider everyone's views with this development as it has caused so much unrest. Most people accept that change must occur at some point, but not to such an extreme as to where our whole area will be transformed to a place that is unrecognisable to those currently living here. I therefore hope and pray that everyone's words will be taken in to consideration and listened to before decisions are made."

Edited by SDCDATA on 20/09/2018 at 18:04