

Comments for Planning Application 19/05000/HYB

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/05000/HYB

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 27,659 sq m GEA; works within the X enclave relating to energetic testing operations, including fencing, access, car parking; development of up to 750 residential dwellings; development of a mixed use village centre (use classes A1/A3/A4/A5/B1a/D1/D2); 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

Customer Details

Name: Mr Dirk Wiemer

Address: Rectory House Church Approach Cudham, Sevenoaks

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Interested Parties

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the inclusion of site 57 in the plan. I feel that the plan is unsound and it fails to comply with the duty to co-operate for the following reasons. 1. It is contrary to policy ST1 - a balanced strategy for growth. This is not balanced in relation to the policy which states "there should be moderate developments within the settlements further down the settlement hierarchy". Halstead is not one of the top tier settlements in Sevenoaks. It is much further down the settlement hierarchy - falling at the lower end with 750 homes. 2. ST1 sustainable location- Site 57 is not a sustainable location. Any new development see ST1 paragraph 1.3 states that high value should be placed on distinctive places and communities. 3. Policy LA1 - The increase of 300 units from the original 450 (already granted under previous planning) means that another 'village' will be created in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This is contrary to Policy LA1 which states "Kent Downs and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and their settings will be given the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty." The proposed site does not demonstrate appropriate scale and form or layout in relation to adjacent settlements and patterns - also contrary to Policy LA1. 4. The NPPF paragraphs 172 - states that "great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONB areas which have the highest status of protection." Site 57 is located in one of only 40 areas of AONB in England and Wales, (which was created by the legislation of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside

Act 1949). 5. Policy WN1 - safeguarding places for wildlife and nature. Any building on this site would be contrary to this policy as the site contains ancient woodlands. The policy states in Chapter 6, paragraph 6.6 that ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat. This site is one of biodiversity, being home to deer, badgers, bats and dormice that cannot not be relocated. See also NPPF paragraph 172. 6. Chapter 5 Green Belt paragraph 5.6 - Sevenoaks DC commissioned ARUP to prepare a Green Belt Study of the Sevenoaks area. Site 57 is located in land parcel 76 (Halstead, Badgers Mount and Knockholt) which scored 3rd place out of 101 parcels. It is rated as one of the strongest performing pieces of Green Belt in the district. Site 57 is located in a highly sensitive area of Green Belt, adjacent to the London Borough of Bromley. Fulfilling 3 of the purposes of the Green Belt: to check against unrestricted sprawl, to prevent towns merging together and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 7. Policy T1 - There is not the infrastructure locally to cope with a development of this size on this site. Policy T1 states that the plan will look to reduce traffic congestion. The inclusion of this site is contrary to policy. 8. Housing Density- Policy H5 states that "the density of the development should be at least equivalent to that found in the area, with no unacceptable impact on local character." The proposed density of 40 DPH is greater than that found locally. The current density is approximately 18.8 DPH. Also our villages are not served well by public transport, local or community facilities (H5 point 3 & 4) so higher density should not be approved. 9. H3- Housing in rural areas. This policy states that the local plan should follow the local need as identified in an up-to date rural housing needs survey (see H3 paragraph 1 & 2). Halstead completed its own recent rural survey which identified that it needed 14 homes to meet local need. SDC put this figure higher at 100 but this is still not as high as the 750 that is proposed for site 57. 10. ST2 Housing and Mixed use site allocations- The developers proposed plan for site 57 includes a greater percentage of 3 and 4 bedroom homes than are recommended in the policy. 11. Contamination- Site 57 contains radioactive depleted uranium in areas that are proposed for housing. Along with: photo chemicals, cyanide and asbestos.