

From: [Bernard Holloway](#)
To: [Planning Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Fort Halstead ref 19/05000/HYB
Date: 27 July 2020 18:53:12

Re sent incorrect e-mail address

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 July 2020 17:00
To: 'planningpolicy@sevenoaks.gov.uk' <planningpolicy@sevenoaks.gov.uk>
Subject: Fort Halstead ref 19/05000/HYB

26th July 2020

Planning Policy
Sevenoaks District Council
Council Offices, Argyle Road
Sevenoaks
Kent TN13 1HG

- planning.policy@sevenoaks.gov.uk; alison.salter@sevenoaks.gov.uk; dc.north@sevenoaks.gov.uk; cllr.fleming@sevenoaks.gov.uk

Ref: Amended Application—proposed development of 635 houses at Fort Halstead.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing to advise of my objections to the long drawn out saga for the redevelopment of Fort Halstead, namely the amendment to the most recent application for the construction of some 635 dwellings.

I have written to the planning department in respect of previous applications setting out my objections. These are now a matter of record and should be referred to in conjunction with this correspondence as I do not propose to reiterate them here as they remain unaltered and are mainly in accord with representations made by the Parish Council and The Knockholt Society. In my most recent correspondence I drew the planning officers attention to the proposals for the neighbouring development of the Broke Hill site in the London Borough of Bromley and the inevitable strain this and that proposed for Fort Halstead would place on the surrounding facilities and infrastructure during both the construction phases and upon completion together, in precis, of the decimation of the local area as we know it. These two schemes should not be looked at in isolation because of their close proximity nor because the former falls outside of SDC's jurisdiction.. I can find no indication in either of these submissions that any of the above concerns have been addressed. No clinics, mains services, road improvements apart from site access and the list goes on. The proposals to encroach and develop green belt land set dangerous precedents. Indeed SDC concluded at one juncture large-scale housing development of the Fort Halstead site was unsustainable. I assume 635 dwelling will be deemed to fall within this category!

This latest proposal is not in accord with tenants adopted by SDC in 2015 in respect of the approval of plans for the:- 'Redevelopment of Fort Halstead' that included a range of employment lead uses that should provide at least the number of existing jobs on the site provided by DSTL.

As a further reminder SDC agreed at that time to: "Residential development of up to 450 units with community facilities built on the development with various commercial buildings in all providing 1483 jobs, incl QinetiQ, on a live work basis".

We now see in the latest application an increase of 185 dwellings and no live work/employment lead use. As a matter of fact the applicants estimate of DPH is between 25 -50 dwellings. Have you evaluated the actual number of residents that will actually be housed within these parameters per hectare?. It is jointly as important to ascertain this as it is to stipulate the DPH as it's the outside facilities and infrastructure re off site that will have to accommodate the burden of the addition population, increased road movements all brought to your attention in the past and of course the decimation, there's that word once again, of the identity of Knockholt and Halstead. Please look into this carefully and reply to me with a reasoned confirmation of why the council deems the existing infrastructure and facilities in the surrounding area can accommodate this influx of population. The opening up of Star Hill to serve the site is totally unacceptable for reasons that have previously been brought to the planning departments attention and I trust you will before making any decision to use this road commission a proper traffic census that will advise how heavily trafficked it is .

This area North of Sevenoaks seems to be earmarked for an unfair share of redevelopment I ask the Council officers to take a more balanced view in respect of the allocation of development and take into consideration all other brown field sites and unused commercial buildings that could be renovated and provide the required quota of housing for the area.

I write this objection not because I don't want it in my back yard but because I sincerely believe the march of development within the M25 ring in this area of Kent and its outer perimeter is now endemic and someone somewhere has to make a stand and I ask that the Council and its officers make a stand over this matter.

Yours sincerely, B Holloway

