

From: Debbie Edwards [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 April 2021 17:38
To: Planning Comments
Cc: laura.trott.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Objection: 19/05000/HYB - Amended Application - Proposed Development of 635 houses at Ford Halstead

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

Dear Ms Shearing,

Please find comments below on the revised planning application: **19/05000/HYB - Amended Application - Proposed Development of 635 houses at Ford Halstead.**

I would be grateful if these would be logged as an objection to the application.

I note, and reiterate my comments of 23 July 2020.

This application increases the number of houses and reduces the area allocated for commercial development, when I understand that the original permission that SDC granted was for an employment-led scheme. This is taking place on Green Belt land, in an area which has a disproportionate number of planning applications in hand (Broke Hill being chief among them) with no justification for doing so. If both approved, this would lead to an additional 3,500 houses in a rural area - utterly swamping the local character, and far more than the local transport infrastructure can cope with (narrow lanes, blind corners, and limited capacity on train services).

I understand that the hotel originally planned has disappeared from the application, and the number of houses has increased by 40%. The housing density proposed, of 25 to 50 dwellings per hectare is 2-3 times the local average.

I understand that Polhill is fragile and has a history of land slippage. Why then, would it be wise to add a significant increase in traffic to Polhill by approving this application? If Polhill is closed, the alternative would be to reroute traffic through Knockholt and Halstead's roads, which are already difficult to navigate with e.g. cars parked on the road, and currently, lorries undertaking the construction of Rowan Court in Halstead.

This is not a sustainable application and will have a disproportionate adverse effect on local villages. It is unnecessary building on Green Belt land - no exceptional circumstances noted that I can see.

Regards

Debbie Edwards
(Rectory, TN14 7HQ)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <publicaccess@sevenoaks.gov.uk>

Date: Thu, 23 Jul 2020 at 15:47

Subject: Comments for Planning Application 19/05000/HYB

To: [REDACTED]

Mrs Debbie Edwards,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 3:47 PM on 23 Jul 2020 from Mrs Debbie Edwards.

Application Summary

Address: DSTL Fort Halstead Crow Drive Halstead Sevenoaks
KENT TN14 7BU

Proposal: Hybrid application comprising, in outline: development of business space (use classes B1a/b/c) of up to 27,773 sqm GEA; works within the X enclave relating to energetic testing operations, including fencing, access, car parking; development of up to 635 residential dwellings; development of a mixed use village centre (use classes A1/A3/A4/A5/B1a/D1/D2); land safeguarded for a primary school; change of use of Fort Area and bunkers to Historic Interpretation Centre (use class D1) with workshop space and; associated landscaping, works and infrastructure. In detail: demolition of existing buildings; change of use and works including extension and associated alterations to buildings Q13 and Q14 including landscaping and public realm, and primary and secondary accesses to the site.

Case Officer: Claire Shearing

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Debbie Edwards
Email: [REDACTED]
Address: The Rectory, Church Road Halstead Sevenoaks

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Interested Parties

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I note the revised application reduces housing density from previous applications. However, I understand that it is still c. twice as dense as neighbouring developments, and so is disproportionate for the area. Access to the development from Star Hill is unwise - this is a tricky road to access/exit currently, and addition of significant levels of traffic is surely unwise.