

From: Trish Rae [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 April 2021 18:20
To: Planning Comments
Cc: laura.trott.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Fort Halstead - amended application for 635 houses Ref: 19/05000/HYB

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Att: Ms Claire Shearing – Case Officer

Ref: 19/05000/HYB Amended application – proposed development of 635 houses at Fort Halstead

Dear Ms Shearing

Thank you for your letter of 22nd March advising us of the amended application for proposed development at Fort Halstead.

It's now April 2021 and we're faced with **yet** another alteration in the development plans for Fort Halstead, necessitating **yet** another letter of objection.

Since the SDC in 2015 planning approval for 450 houses to be built on land at Fort Halstead, the figure has seesawed up and down and we are now left contemplating the possibility of 635 homes, with the probability of at least 2 extra cars per household (adding to the usual, daily village traffic) on the narrow, winding, badly maintained country lanes which surround Fort Halstead.

This is a 'small village' sized development, with as yet no school, doctor's surgery or shop and, contrary to the initial plans, far less possibility of becoming '*employment led*' as there are fewer commercial units now available, having been replaced by housing. This of course means that much of the working population of Fort Halstead will be looking for jobs outside the site, using public transport that, at present, is just not up to scratch, (not to mention the extra cars on the roads).

Which brings me to the proposed exit/entrance on to Starhill Road, which was once designated a restricted entrance and is now being considered a '*secondary*' entrance. What does that mean and how would it be policed? To allow unrestricted traffic from the site out on to Starhill Road would be a mistake. Even with remedial roadworks at the entrance, the road is narrow and winding with bad sight lines at the side entrance to the Fort; traffic travels fast and cyclists are legion since the 2012 Olympics. In 2015, SDC, in granting

planning 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'*. What has changed since then? Only the increased volume of traffic. Despite it being a bus route, Starhill Road is a **still** a country road, leading to a country village and so it should remain.

The Green Belt was introduced to protect our beautiful countryside from town and city encroachment and unnecessary development and we live in a particularly beautiful part of Kent, high on the North Downs. Progress is inevitable, but I feel that the size of this development, as currently planned, is inconsistent with the ideals and spirit of the Green Belt.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Patricia Rae
Leesfield,
Starhill Road,
Knockholt, Sevenoaks,
Kent TN14 7JW

Sent from [Outlook](#)