

[REDACTED]

From: Clare Greener [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 July 2020 10:36
To: Planning Comments
Subject: Re: Amended Application—proposed development of 635 houses at Fort Halstead.
NB: the link to your website has not always worked, but it's believed your ref is 19/05000/HYB

Morning Peter, my address is 3 Ethel Terrace, Rushmore Hill, Orpington, Kent BR6 7LY.

Kind regards, Clare

Sent from my iPhone

On 27 Jul 2020, at 20:51, Planning Comments <planning.comments@sevenoaks.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Ms Game,

Thank you for your email forwarded by Planning Policy.

In order for us to record and publish your comments on the application 19/05000/HYB, I'd be grateful if you would supply your full postal address.

Kind regards
Peter

Peter Bareford
Administrative Assistant
Development Management
Sevenoaks District Council | Council Offices | Argyle Road | Sevenoaks | Kent | TN13 1HG

Tel: 01732 227000

www.sevenoaks.gov.uk

Please note our office hours are as follows; Monday – Thursday 08:45 – 17:00 Friday 08:45 – 16:45

From: Clare Greener [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 July 2020 18:24
To: Planning Policy <Planning.Policy@sevenoaks.gov.uk>
Cc: alison.salter@sevenoaks.gov.uk; DC North <dc.north@sevenoaks.gov.uk>; Cllr Fleming, Peter <cldr.fleming@sevenoaks.gov.uk>
Subject: Amended Application—proposed development of 635 houses at Fort Halstead. NB: the link to your website has not always worked, but it's believed your ref is 19/05000/HYB

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing to you to set out my objections to the amendment involving the proposed development of 635 homes at Fort Halstead.

The amended proposal represents an INCREASE of 185 houses/over 40% on the 2015 'employment-led' permission—with a few minor amendments such as a reduction in some building heights and some housing density. On the latter, it's worth remembering that the average density locally is 15 to 18 dwellings per hectare (DPH): this application's density is 25 to 50 DPH...

We are talking about the development of a sprawling housing estate far bigger than Knockholt; potentially home to around 2,500 people, and probably 1,500+ cars! And where are the 'appropriate community facilities and infrastructure' you demanded in 2015?

I am particularly concerned with road safety, especially as the existing outlet to Star Hill Road is integral to this new amendment. 'Condition 14' of the 2015 permission required that: 'before the development could proceed, we require details to show how the Star Hill access would be restricted and maintained for use only by buses, emergency vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians and horses'.

Star Hill Road:

- is badly maintained; has no footpaths; is narrow; has a series of completely blind bends; is much favoured by cycling clubs because of its hilly challenge; has been the scene of numerous accidents;
- is totally inadequate to cope with the potential 1,500+ new cars, as well as heavy goods vehicles/delivery vans likely to service the 635 homes;
- and if this access is allowed, it will turn Knockholt and surrounding villages into rat runs with all the dangers inherent.

The Star Hill Road exit is described as 'secondary' in this amendment, but no measures are in place to define that. Throughout Fort Halstead's operational history, even during peak employment years, this exit has always been restricted. It would be extremely dangerous to allow free flowing traffic to use this exit onto a derestricted road. Visibility is limited and traffic from the north is on the brow of a blind hill. Any proposed speed limits on Star Hill Road are unlikely to slow approaching traffic and will have no effect on the condition of this road, as described above.

As for the traffic estimates that supported the 2015 application:

- At Knockholt Parish Council's (KPC) planning committee at the time a councillor accurately described them as an insult to the intelligence of everyone living in the area;
- As highlighted in D. Barton's report in 2015, this was (and is) a development remote from essential services—car ownership will be essential.

Can I remind you of what the Society said in its letter dated 15 August 2015 (your ref. SE/15/00628/OUT): 'SDC states that the development must be employment-led. If that does not happen, there is a very real danger that the developer will seek to replace business/industrial buildings with more profitable housing'.

COVID-19 has shown all of us just how important Green Belt land, the environment, and the ability to access open spaces is for this, and future, generations.

Please rescind the 2015 'Employment-led' planning permission on the grounds that it bears no reality whatsoever to what is being applied for today, which is an out-and-out crammed together housing estate answering NONE of the demands SDC called for in granting permission in 2015.

Yours sincerely,

Clare Game

Sent from my iPhone

Debit/credit card payments for planning applications, pre-application enquiries and Appeals can be made online at our website.

<https://myaccount.sevenoaks.gov.uk/planning-payment/> For all other Planning payment queries please telephone us on 01732 227000 or email planning.information@sevenoaks.gov.uk Our office hours are Monday - Thursday 08:45 - 17:00 and Friday 08:45 - 16:45



This email may contain privileged/confidential information. It is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient you may not copy, deliver or disclose the content of this message to anyone. In such case please destroy/delete the message immediately and notify the sender by reply email. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Sevenoaks District Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by the Council. All email communications sent to or from Sevenoaks District Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

How do we [handle your data](#)? Would you like to [unsubscribe from our emails](#)?

Visit the Council at WWW.SEVENOAKS.GOV.UK