

**SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**PARISH /TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATION**  
**CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

<b>Reference :</b>	SE/19/05000/HYB
<b>Site :</b>	DSTL FORT HALSTEAD CROW DRIVE HALSTEAD TN14 7BU
<b>Proposal :</b>	<p>Amended Application:</p> <p>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.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Support</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Objection</b>	<p><i>We are unimpressed by the agent's reference to the 'London Borough of Sevenoaks'! If the quality of their research and insight into the area and situation is so totally inept, we have grave concerns about their proposals over other aspects of the scheme.</i></p> <p><i>Yet again we are confronted by a proposed development that is over-complicated, oversized and not wanted.</i></p> <p><i>We refer to the 2019 Hearing into the submitted Local Plan and the 7 specific questions from the Inspector regarding the Fort Halstead site (listed below) to which answers are still awaited and relevant: -</i></p> <p><i>Q340 (b.) Is the proposed housing.....supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided? (c.)</i></p>

*.....deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?*

*Q341. What are the exceptional circumstances for removing this proposed site from the Green Belt?*

*Q342. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on the Green Belt?*

*Q343. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on the AONB?*

*Q344. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on local wildlife, biodiversity, ancient woodland, and existing local infrastructure, services and facilities, including GP surgeries and schools?*

*Q345. Would the increase of (300) dwellings on this allocated site represent an overdevelopment?*

*Q346. What evidence is there to support the anticipated completions on this site? 450 permitted units by 2031 (plus predicted completions for any additional numbers).*

*We feel that this is an ill-conceived, contrived development, offering yet more commercial form, and justifying the bulk form of this commercial build (of which there is already a large amount vacant in the nearby area, currently put forward for housing in the Local Plan) to obtain the increased housing figure, but once the bulk form is agreed as outline permission, there is no means of stopping allegedly 'non-viable commercial' being turned into yet more housing!*

*The infrastructure in the locality will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic, Polhill is already struggling, with the future threat of being reduced to one lane in either direction as the result of ongoing monitored subsidence. The railway station has insufficient parking, with both parts of the car park being sold off. Furthermore, Network South East Rail have already confirmed there can be no increase in service as trains cannot increase in size because platforms further up the line are not large enough, and there is no possibility of more trains before 2044.*

*We ridicule the repetitive promotion of cycling as the solution to the inevitable gridlock that will be caused by circa 2000+ private cars and numerous vans using the commercial premises. The developers should be challenged to explain exactly how the residents are expected to travel and access shops, schools and healthcare.*

*This application would rely on the use of cars, as Public Transport is nigh on non-existent and if people with older vehicles were to enter the*

*London Borough of Bromley they would be entering the Low Emission Zone and subject to exorbitant fines, which puts the nearest hospitals, the Princess Royal Hospital, Farnborough and Orpington Hospital out of bounds, incurring lengthy journeys to hospitals in Kent.*

*We fully understand what 'outline' planning means, it is a blueprint for the developer to 'cherry pick' where they want to put the development and when, and as previously said, once granted in principle, the countryside would be irreparably blighted.*

*The cumulative effect this proposal (plus others at Appeal or threatened) would create a housing surplus in this area, whereas it is stated that development should be appropriate to local need.*

*According to SDC's own Allocation Tables handed out at the Local Plan Hearing, the 'Combined Population, Services, Green Belt and Employment Scores' for our settlements were 20, 15, and 7, placing us in the 'small villages' and 'hamlet' categories – clearly demonstrating the inability to sustain the proposed massive increases.*

*The proposal does not comply with SDC's own ADMP, which states any major development should be at the major sites of Sevenoaks, Westerham, Edenbridge and Swanley.*

*We insist that a fully detailed Energy Requirement Study be undertaken for the site, which is currently heated by oil which will be neither adequate or environmentally desirable – will they all be electrically heated, and all have car charging points?*

*We also question the adequacy of the water supply to the site as it has been widely reported that over the past two years the existing residents have had to survive for a total of 38 weeks on bottled water alone, how can this be justified in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? How will the proposed housing and commercial need be met?*

*All of these points are not just concerns of the local residents, but were raised by the Inspector at the Local Plan Hearing in 2019 as questions requiring detailed responses, as listed above.*

*This development and totally inadequate infrastructure does not take into consideration the 200 HGV movements per day which would be generated from the Chevening bund construction and the Westerham quarry infill adding to the inevitable increase in traffic on the rural lanes.*

*Finally, we find this application an ill-conceived over development which would be on highly contaminated land (as per the Waterman Report which showed significant multi-agent contamination in 38 of the test bore holes, which is stated would be hazardous to the health of construction workers, residents and visitors and would require*

	<i>remediation works) and also contrary to the core development areas, the ADMP and policies GB1, GB4, GB5 and EN1, as this neither preserves nor enhances the Green Belt.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>No Comment/ Comments Only</b>	
<b>FROM:</b>	Zoe Brookman Clerk to Knockholt Parish Council
<b>DATE:</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> April 2021